

9
Vol. 7

DEC 18 1933
No. 4

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

October, 1933

Some Effects of the American Civil War
on Canadian Agriculture.

Fred Landon

Rise of the Tobacco Warehouse Auction
System in Virginia, 1800-1860.

Joseph Clarke Robert

Social and Agrarian Background of the
Pilgrim Fathers.

G. E. Fussell



Published Quarterly
by

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Published Quarterly by the Agricultural History Society

Editor

EVERETT E. EDWARDS, United States Department of Agriculture.

Associate Editors

HERBERT A. KELLAR, McCormick Historical Association, Chicago.

O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture.

CLARIBEL R. BARNETT, United States Department of Agriculture.

KATHLEEN BRUCE, Hollins College.

G. E. FUSSELL, Great Britain Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries.

W. SEEDORF, Instituts für Landwirtschaftliche, Betriebs- und Landarbeitslehre an der Universität Göttingen.

CONTENTS

Some Effects of the American Civil War on Canadian Agriculture.

Fred Landon 163

Rise of the Tobacco Warehouse Auction System in Virginia, 1800-1860

Joseph Clarke Robert 170

Social and Agrarian Background of the Pilgrim Fathers

G. E. Fussell 183

Edmund Ruffin, Southerner

Everett E. Edwards 203

News Notes and Comments

206

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY is designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included, and also materials on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

Correspondence concerning contributions and books for review may be sent to Everett E. Edwards, Room 3035, South Building, 13th and B Streets, S.W., Washington, D. C.; correspondence concerning membership dues and business matters, to O. C. Stine, at the same address.

Agricultural History is sent to members of the Agricultural History Society. Annual membership, \$3.00; life membership, \$100.00. A list of the articles in earlier numbers of Agricultural History will be found on the back cover. Single numbers and back files may be obtained from the secretary.

The Agricultural History Society assumes no responsibility for statements, whether of fact or of opinion, made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter, October 12, 1928, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

VOLUME 7, NUMBER 4, October, 1933

CONTRIBUTORS

Mr. Fred Landon ("Some Effects of the American Civil War on Canadian Agriculture") is librarian of the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario. He was educated at the University of Western Ontario (B.A., 1906; M.A., 1919). From 1906 to 1916 he was connected with the editorial department of the London Free Press and from 1916 to 1923 was librarian of the London Public Library. He was lecturer in American history in the University of Western Ontario from 1917 to 1923, and associate professor after that date. He is the author of numerous articles in American and Canadian historical journals, particularly on the slavery question and the negro in America. He is also the author (with Jesse Edgar Middleton) of a four-volume work, *The Province of Ontario: A History, 1615-1927* (Toronto, Dominion Publishing Co., 1927). He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1929 and has been a member of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada since 1931.

Dr. Joseph C. Robert ("Rise of the Tobacco Warehouse Auction System in Virginia, 1800-1860") is a resident of Richmond, Virginia. He is a graduate of Furman University (A.B., 1927), and Duke University (A.M., 1929; Ph.D., 1933). During 1929-30 he held the Watauga Fellowship at Harvard University. He has taught at the University of Richmond and at Duke University. The essay here printed is an extract, with some rearrangement and condensation, from his doctoral dissertation, "The Tobacco Industry in the Virginia-Carolina Area, 1800-1860."

Mr. G. E. Fussell ("Social and Agrarian Background of the Pilgrim Fathers") is a member of the Great Britain Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. He is recognized as an outstanding authority on the history of English agriculture, and has written numerous articles on the subject. For a note concerning his writings see *Agricultural History*, 6:185-186 (October, 1932). He is an associate editor of *Agricultural History*. Recently he was honored by an invitation to become a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of England.

SOME EFFECTS OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR ON CANADIAN AGRICULTURE¹

FRED LANDON

The effects of the American Civil War upon Canadian life and development have only of late begun to receive the attention merited by their importance. Thus far, study of the war in its relation to Canada has been confined chiefly to the influence exerted upon the movement for confederation of the British provinces in North America. This in itself is of such importance that a leading Canadian historian has expressed the view that "one is justified in regarding the American Civil War as one of the profoundest influences in Canadian history."² In any attempt to determine the war's effects upon Canadian agriculture, either immediate or ultimate, it must be remembered that during the six years before April, 1861, Canadian agricultural products had entry to American markets such as they had never before enjoyed. The Reciprocity Treaty, which had been negotiated during the administration of President Pierce and which owed much to the diplomacy of the Canadian Governor-General, Lord Elgin, became effective in the spring of 1855. Under its terms a long list of natural products were admitted free of duty by each country. The prosperity which Canada thereby experienced, stimulated in the first two years by the Crimean War, suffered only temporary check in 1857, and the annual value of the goods exchanged between the two countries increased over two and one-half times in the period between 1855 and 1866 when the treaty was terminated by Washington. The increase in trade during the last four years of the treaty period was chiefly due to the Civil War.

¹ Presented in substance at the session of the Agricultural History Society with the American Historical Association and other historical societies at Toronto, Ontario, on Dec. 28, 1932.

² Professor Chester Martin in the *Canadian Historical Review*, 13:19 (March, 1932).

Canada between 1861 and 1865 was not the political area known by that name today. The vast territory from the Great Lakes to the Rocky Mountains was still the hunting preserve of the Hudson's Bay Company. British Columbia was so remote that it was almost an unknown country to the British provinces in the east. The maritime provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, were developing but slowly, owing in part to lack of capital. Canada proper consisted of the present Ontario and Quebec, commonly known as Upper and Lower Canada, though united for administrative purposes since 1841. Quebec divided its attention between lumbering and an agriculture that was backward and primitive. The census of 1861 had shown diminishing wheat production in Quebec, the quantity raised not being half the amount required to feed the population. Upper Canada (Ontario of today) was the most populous and by far the most progressive of the British provinces in North America. It was still predominantly rural in character with wheat as its main staple, and the spring wheat acreage was increasing rapidly. The three counties of York, Ontario, and Peel produced more wheat in 1860 than all of Lower Canada.³ Naturally, Upper Canada was more responsive to any influence which the struggle between the States might exert on agriculture.

At the outbreak of the war in April, 1861, it was generally believed in Upper Canada that the demand for agricultural products would be stimulated and that there would be a heavy demand for wheat. "In the present condition of the world," said one agricultural journal, "we see no prospect of prices ruling low, and there is every motive for our Canadian farmers to get in as large a breadth of wheat as possible the coming autumn, with a reasonable prospect of remunerative returns."⁴

Canadian farmers suffered disappointment in their expectation of a war-time market eagerly bidding for their wheat. The United States was not only able to supply all its own extraor-

³ *Canadian Agriculturist*, 14:551-552 (Sept. 16, 1862).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13:401, 419 (July 1, 16, 1861). The *Halifax Morning Chronicle* was quoted with regard to increased farming activity in Nova Scotia: "This unwonted activity is mainly owing to the prospect of a long and uncertain war in the 'States' and a consequent neglect of the usual farming operations."

dinary needs but, in addition, exported more wheat than in any previous period of its history. In the loyal States and Territories, production increased from 142 million bushels in 1859 to 187 million in 1862 and 191 million in 1863 which marked the peak of war-time production. Exports grew from 17 million bushels in 1860 to 53 million bushels in 1861, to 62 million bushels in 1862 and remained as high as 58 million bushels in 1863. England, suffering from bad harvests and unable to secure adequate supplies elsewhere, took nearly all of the American wheat and flour exported during these years.

In this period of vastly increased American production, yields in Upper Canada were below average in the years 1862, 1863, and 1864 while prices dropped as compared with those of 1859 and 1860. Wheat prices on the Toronto market between 1858 and 1867 averaged as follows:⁵ fall wheat, 1858, \$1.06; 1859, \$1.40; 1860, \$1.31; 1861, \$1.15; 1862, \$1.00; 1863, \$.95; 1864, \$.96; 1865, \$1.20; 1866, \$1.60; 1867, \$1.80; and spring wheat, 1858, \$.81; 1859, \$1.16; 1860, \$1.07; 1861, \$.95; 1862, \$.84; 1863, \$.83; 1864, \$.83; 1865, \$1.03; 1866, \$1.31; 1867, \$1.60.

An example of local prices for wheat outside of Toronto is furnished in the records kept between 1854 and 1867 by David Panabaker, a farmer in Waterloo County in the western part of Upper Canada. In only four years during the period mentioned did he receive less than one dollar a bushel for his wheat, these low years being 1857, 1862, 1863, and 1864.⁶

Although disappointed with regard to their wheat, Canadian farmers experienced a stimulated demand for other agricultural products. Exports of livestock were large during the war period, horses being especially in demand. Cattle exports reached their peak in 1865, shipments in the later months of that year being probably in anticipation of the approaching termination of the reciprocity agreement.⁷ Warnings were heard that Upper Can-

⁵ *Statistical Contributions to Canadian Economic History*, 2:59 (Toronto, Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1931).

⁶ *Waterloo County Historical Society, Annual Report* (1929), 17:101-103.

⁷ "Almost double the weight of cattle, at nearly double the price, has found its way across the Bridge in the year 1865, over any former year," *Canada Farmer*, 3:41 (Feb. 1, 1866).

ada was allowing too many of its cattle to leave the country and would find itself facing a shortage for domestic requirements. There was reason for this warning as coöperative cheese-making had been introduced and was making rapid headway. Throughout this period the agricultural journals stressed the value of the cheese industry, devoting much space to descriptions of improved methods of manufacture. The beginnings of an export cheese trade received comment in the President's address at the Provincial Exhibition of 1865, held in the city of London, emphasis being laid upon the value of the cheese product should new markets have to be sought as a result of the cessation of reciprocity. The coöperative plan of cheese manufacture was a direct importation from New York State, a number of the pioneers in the industry in Canada being of American origin.

The enormous demand for wool for making army clothing exhausted all available supplies in the United States, and American buyers resorted to the Canadian market. The great bulk of the Canadian export was sent to the United States, the volume increasing from 32,472 pounds in 1860 to upwards of 300,000 pounds in 1865 and in value from less than \$9,000 in the earlier year to about \$140,000 in the last year of the war. Prices rose steadily during the war, from 25 cents a pound in 1861 to 40 cents in 1864, declining to 35 cents in 1866 and to 28 cents in 1867.⁸

The demand for materials to be used in the manufacture of clothing also gave impetus to the growing of flax in Canada. Linen was not made in the United States during the Civil War, foreign importations, chiefly from Ireland, being thereby greatly increased. Upper Canada raised its acreage of flax from about 3,000 acres in 1863 to over 10,000 acres in 1865 in an effort to take advantage of the market offered across the boundary and as a step toward repairing the failure of wheat as a source of revenue. A number of flax scutching mills were established in the Province at this time, notably in some of the western counties.⁹

⁸ "Agricultural Products and Markets during 1865," *Canada Farmer*, 3:40-42 (Feb. 1, 1866). See especially the paragraphs on wool, p. 42. Prices are quoted from *Statistical Contributions to Canadian Economic History*, 2:58.

⁹ "Cultivation and Manufacture of Flax," *Canada Farmer*, 1:1-2 (Jan. 15,

The failure of the wheat crop during the years when highly profitable yields had been anticipated caused widespread discussion of the question of whether the lands of the Province were worn out by continuous wheat cropping. Newspapers and agricultural journals laid emphasis upon the necessity of more attention to manuring, root growing, livestock and a judicious rotation of crops in order to preserve the fertility of the land. Predictions were made that henceforth there would be proportionately less wheat grown in Upper Canada and that more attention would be given to dairying, livestock, and mixed farming. From this period, the development of a more scientific agriculture in Canada, including increased attention to innovations in other countries, can be traced. It is significant that shortly after the war the Honorable John Carling, commissioner of agriculture, sent W. F. Clarke, editor of the *Canada Farmer*, to examine the work of the new agricultural colleges which were being established in the United States. A few years later the Ontario Agricultural College was founded.

Among the agricultural changes of the Civil War period none is more noticeable than the stimulus given to the introduction and use of labor-saving farm machinery. This development was particularly significant in the United States and quickly communicated itself to Canada, at least to those portions of the provinces where the land was cleared sufficiently to permit the use of the new machinery. There were still large districts where machinery could not be used to advantage until the stumps and stones had been removed and the surface levelled.

American farm machinery was introduced into Canada in part through Canadian branches of American firms. Joseph Hall of Rochester, New York, had a branch at Oshawa, U. C., where threshing machines, mowers, self-raking reapers and other forms of farm machinery were manufactured. His advertisement and those of other firms appear in the Canadian agricultural journals and in the newspapers of the early sixties. The Provincial

1864). The article describes the Perine scutching mills established at Doon, Conestogo, Drayton and Baden, all in the western part of the province. These four mills were said to be using the product of 1,500 acres of land.

Exhibition of 1864 at Hamilton included a public trial of mowers and reapers, the Provincial Board of Agriculture defraying the freight charges on all reapers and mowers brought to the competition. The Hall firm won the first prize for single mowers, third prize for single reapers, and second prize for combined reapers and mowers.¹⁰ At the Provincial Exhibition of 1865, held in London, there was a similar extensive showing of farm machinery, of which the *Canada Farmer* remarked: "Perhaps the most satisfactory feature of the Exhibition was the display of agricultural implements. A few years since no large agricultural implements were made in Canada at all, and very few were imported. Now we find at the Provincial Exhibition many parties competing as manufacturers of the most costly agricultural implements." Canadian interest in farm machinery was paralleled in the United States where competitive tests of rival reapers, mowers, and other implements stirred the enthusiasm of great crowds at fairs and exhibitions. "The war suddenly popularized methods of cultivation in which the agricultural papers had striven in vain for a decade to arouse interest."

Farm labor was scarce in Canada at this time, but the war does not seem to have affected the supply to any marked extent. The usual migration of Canadians to the United States tended to slacken during the war years, although in 1864, when high bounties were being paid, numbers of young Canadians, many of them from farms, were led to enlist. Sir John Macdonald's statement that forty thousand Canadians served in the armies of the North evidently included Canadian residents of the United States who enlisted. After the middle of 1863 there was a considerable influx of Americans seeking to evade the draft. Their presence tended to depress wages in some of the trades but had no visible effect on the farm labor situation.

A study of the effect of the war upon Canadian finance would probably result in interesting findings. Complaints of the short-

¹⁰ "The Provincial Exhibition," *Canada Farmer*, 1:280-284 (Oct. 1, 1864). More than three and a half columns of space are given to a description of the farm machinery exhibited at Hamilton. Most of this machinery was made in Canada, either by Canadian firms or by branches of American firms.

age of currency and of high interest rates were voiced in the Canadian press in 1864. The variations in exchange must have disturbed regular trade conditions at times. The effect of exchange upon the price of wheat in Canada would bear investigation.

The period of the Civil War marks then the visible beginnings of the transition from wheat growing to the mixed farming which had become inevitable. It is in this period that we find the beginnings of coöperative cheese-making and impetus given to fruit growing, livestock production, and flax growing. These more varied products of the farm furnished raw materials for manufacturing purposes. Flour mills, breweries and distilleries were supplemented by linseed-oil mills, scutching mills, cheese factories, and packing houses. It might well be argued that these changes were assured whether there was peace or war. This may be admitted, but the Civil War hastened their coming just as it stimulated the use of the new farm machinery. The effects of the war upon agriculture bear likeness to those on the movement for federation. In each case one may find a variety of influences at work but the war had dynamic effect in giving full play to these forces.

RISE OF THE TOBACCO WAREHOUSE AUCTION SYSTEM IN VIRGINIA, 1800-1860

JOSEPH CLARKE ROBERT

When the nineteenth century opened, the colonial practice of sale by mere display of the tobacco note, the inspector's warehouse receipt declaring the leaf of good quality, was still common in Virginia. By 1860 there had evolved a system of warehouse auctioning only slightly removed from the modern method.

In the early days of Virginia the merchant usually purchased tobacco notes, carried them to the warehouses, collected his freight, and shipped his cargo. Backed by the oath of a bonded officer, the tobacco note also became a circulating medium, for it certified a definite quantity and quality of a saleable staple.¹ Although it was customary to purchase tobacco in this manner, sight unseen, as late as 1800,² the consideration which the buyer gave to the strictness of the particular inspection which accepted the tobacco and to the reputation of the planter sharply curtailed indiscriminate buying.³

Lax inspecting, which occasionally suffered the passage of not only inferior but worthless leaf,⁴ aroused careful manufacturers to demand that their tobacco be re-inspected by responsible agents.⁵ With this situation arising it was natural for buyers to

¹ W. Z. Ripley, *The Financial History of Virginia, 1609-1776* (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, v. 4), 145-153 (New York, 1893); *Farmers' Register*, 3:757 (1835-36).

² *Southern Planter*, 12:364 (1852).

³ See, for example, *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letter Books*, Wiatt, Ellis & Norvell to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Dec. 18, 1799 (MSS. Library of Congress); William Tatham, *An Historical and Practical Essay on the Culture and Commerce of Tobacco*, 81 (London, 1800).

⁴ *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letters Received*, Thomas Leiper to Ellis & Allan, Philadelphia, Jan. 23, 1802; *Letter Books*, Ellis & Allan to Col. William Taliaferro, Richmond, May 27, 1803.

⁵ *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letter Books*, Ellis & Allan to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Nov. 23, 1801; *Letters Received*, Thomas Leiper to Ellis & Allan, Philadelphia, Dec. 2, 1801.

frequent the state-regulated warehouse when the tobacco was being opened for official inspection, and to observe the sampling. Thus they could intercept the better hogsheads and purchase on the spot from the planter.⁶

At the beginning of the century, however, personal inspection before buying was occasional rather than habitual. It was so different from the traditional method that when effected it was a matter of special remark. Note the pride in the following assertion by Ellis & Allan, merchants of Richmond, concerning a shipment to England in 1803: "The whole of the Cargo will make a very heavy average ours particularly and we think we can recommend this as being a prime selected parcel of James River Tobo. We do not say this merely from the face of the notes but we have seen at least 7/8th of the whole parcel."⁷ Two years later the same partnership boasted of its excellent collection of hogsheads and, obviously to contrast with the usual mode of gathering tobacco for a cargo, declared that the leaf had been either observed at the inspection or had been re-inspected.⁸

The tobacco inspected in rural warehouses and then brought to market towns for sale was longest subject to requests for re-inspection. The planter's reluctance to yield to this demand was based on reasons other than natural conservatism in the face of change. There was damage done to the tobacco and usually the loss of the sample, with no guarantee that the prospective buyer would close the deal. A planter always liked to sell his whole "parcel" at one time, instead of permitting buyers to pick choice hogs-

⁶ Even before the turn of the century shrewder buyers in central markets were attending inspections to examine the hogsheads as they came in, and, if suitable, buying the tobacco from the planter at the same time. See *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letter Books*, William Galt to [?], Richmond, Jan. 18, 1798; Wiatt, Ellis & Norvell to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Dec. 6, 1799. Note the following remark made in 1801, "We think it prudent not to buy for a few days, in the mean time we will attend the Inspections and pick up some that way . . ." Ellis & Allan to [?], Richmond, Nov. 11, 1801.

⁷ *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letter Books*, Ellis & Allan to John Heathcote & Co., Richmond, July 21, 1803. See also Ellis & Allan to Thomas W. Cocke, Richmond, Nov. 30, 1803.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Ellis & Allan to George McIntosh, Richmond, June 3, 1805.

heads and refuse those of lower quality.⁹ The situation was described in 1801 with uncommon clarity by Wiatt, Ellis & Norvell to their client, a Philadelphia snuff manufacturer: "We will use our best judgment in procuring for you the best tobacco. To do this we shall necessarily be obliged to give an extra price. It is not to be expected that any man will suffer his tobo to be looked at and the prime of it selected for the common market price. We can always purchase tobo as it is offered from the face of the manifest [inspector's receipt] for half dollar less than when we re-inspect. You must expect to pay more if you have prime Tobo."¹⁰

It should be kept in mind that there was a demand for tobacco during the first years of the nineteenth century merely by virtue of its having passed the official inspection; the "common market price" was for such. The above letter indicates the conflict between the new demand for quality and the older arrangement of sale. To avoid the difficulties of re-inspection, some shippers in the lower country began sending buyers to the smaller inspections during the tobacco season.¹¹

The new system of sale as it had developed in Lynchburg by 1810 was described at the time by one obviously critical of the innovation:

One or more hogsheads are opened and a public signal is given, by the sound of a trumpet, that the gentlemen speculators may attend. As many as may be in readiness come forward. The tobacco is broken open, and each one present inspects for himself, and makes up his own private opinion of its quality. The planter must then instantly sell to one of the persons present, for if the sale be deferred, he will be subjected to another inspection. It follows of course, that one of four, six or eight men, sometimes one of two or three, must be the purchaser.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Wiatt, Ellis & Norvell to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Nov. 1, Dec. 4, 9, 1799; Ellis & Allan to [?], Richmond, Nov. 11, 1801; Ellis & Allan to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Nov. 23, 1801.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Wiatt, Ellis & Norvell to Thomas Leiper, Richmond, Mar. 9, 1801.

¹¹ Note the transitional era suggested by the following letter: "Our parcel we consider as prime a parcel as will be shipped from here this year; our Charles Ellis was at the trouble of attending the upland inspections and buying none but what he knew to be prime. What we have not seen in that way we can place the utmost confidence in from the well known character of the planter and the part of the country where the crops were made." *Ellis & Allan Papers, Letter Books*, Ellis & Allan to John Heathcote & Co., Richmond, May 22, 1803. Also see Ellis & Allan to Thomas W. Cocke, Richmond, Dec. 20, 1804.

None others having seen it, they only are prepared to judge of its value. Possibly the planter may think the offers made him are illiberal, yet it is dangerous to reject them, for if once the gentlemen who attended the inspection turn their backs upon him, he may hawk it up and down the streets in vain. The men who are considered the best judges and who are always ready to buy that which they approve, have seen and refused it, and therefore those who have not seen, cannot act prudently to buy it at all. And as but few men can devote their whole attention to the warehouses, the competitors are but few; insomuch that the buying of tobacco has almost become a monopoly. Still, however, it must be admitted that these men act judiciously, and as they ought to do, under existing circumstances.

Strict regard is had to the qualities of tobacco when carried to any foreign market. Judicious shippers, therefore, re-inspect all their purchases, before they send them on board their vessels. And there are houses in this town, which expend four or five hundred dollars a season in re-opening their tobacco on that very account. It therefore clearly follows, that respect must be had to that circumstance in the first purchase.

But this mode of doing the business is new to the planters, and many of them are so embarrassed by it as to receive real injury.¹²

By its very nature the custom of actual examination of the hogshead, once started, grew rapidly. With buyers culling the inspections of choice tobacco, purchasers of tobacco notes in the old way naturally found that they had been presented with claims on less desirable leaf, perhaps barely able to pass a lenient inspection. The intense speculation after the War of 1812 attracted buyers in large numbers to the principal inspection points, resulting in a further expansion of the market towns and obliteration of smaller warehouses which had not evolved into markets. By the second decade of the century, sale at the warehouse was well established.¹³

Warehouse sale of the leaf preceded the development of a definite auction system. Although an impromptu type of auction sale was perhaps in existence before the War of 1812, its widespread adoption came about after that conflict. There is doubt as to the amount of tobacco disposed of in this manner during the second decade,¹⁴ but by the middle of the third, selling by auction

¹² *The Enquirer*, Richmond, Jan. 30, 1810.

¹³ The *Petersburg Intelligencer* remarked concerning the process of sale in 1820: "The moment the Tobacco is inspected, the purchasers are upon the spot, and the seller realizes its value immediately." Quoted in *Richmond Enquirer*, July 18, 1820.

¹⁴ There are, however, many references to auction sales of tobacco in the *Ellis & Allan Papers* and newspapers current for the period after the War of 1812.

had become sufficiently well established for the inspector to be taken to task for assuming the rôle of auctioneer.

With the growth of actual examination by the buyer before purchasing, the inspector had suffered a temporary eclipse, for his tobacco note was no longer considered a certificate of real quality. However, with buyer and planter together in the warehouse, the inspector acted sometimes as auctioneer, sometimes as commission merchant, and sometimes as both. Incidentally, as precedent for the auction system there had been legally directed public sales of transfer and waste tobacco, presided over by the inspector.¹⁵

The Virginia tobacco law, if obeyed, would have prevented the inspectors from connecting themselves with the actual sale of tobacco. In the first place, they were expressly forbidden to receive any fees, other than those provided by law, for performing the duties of inspectors; and in the second place, the list of prohibitions for inspectors and their assistants declared that they should not "in any manner, for themselves, or for any other person purchase, sell, stem manufacture, barter, lend, or exchange any tobacco, inspected at their said warehouses. . . ."¹⁶ Whereas the inspectors might have claimed exemption from the first restriction under the fiction that their activities as auctioneers or commission merchants were foreign to their duties as *inspectors*, only the flimsiest reasoning could absolve them from violating both letter and spirit of the second law. At least so thought the committee of the House of Delegates appointed at the 1825-26 session to examine abuses in the state tobacco warehouses.

With a cautiousness demanded by the important character of the subject, the committee report remarked the violation of the law, granted that there were differences of opinion as to whether the new practice worked to the planter's disadvantage, but recommended provisions to guarantee obedience to the letter of the rule.

¹⁵ *Laws of Virginia*, 1792, ch. 18, sec. 24, as in Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 13:498-499; *Virginia Code of 1819*, ch. 220, sec. 40. New rule in regard to waste tobacco in *Acts of Virginia Assembly*, 1825-26, ch. 14, sec. 2.

¹⁶ *Virginia Code of 1819*, ch. 220, sec. 37, 50. See *Laws of Virginia*, 1792, ch. 18, sec. 30, as in Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 13:502.

The report, which dealt more particularly with the Richmond situation, contained a paragraph concerning the newly grown appendage of the inspection system:

The inhibition of the inspectors from dealing in, or deriving any emolument from the sales of tobacco, although founded in wisdom, has not been very strictly observed in Richmond. It was the opinion of several witnesses, that the violation of the law in this respect, had frequently produced an improper lenity and preference in favour of those planters who allowed to the inspectors an emolument upon their sales: and although other witnesses equally respectable, were of a different opinion, your committee recommend an efficient provision to ensure a strict observance of that valuable feature of the inspection law.¹⁷

If not among the actual witnesses examined by the committee, certainly in agreement with those "other witnesses equally respectable . . . of a different opinion" from that of the committee was James Caskie, who had been "constantly a dealer in tobacco for almost twenty years, regularly attending at the inspections for the purpose of making purchases. . . ." Caskie declared that the system of public auction which had become established was highly beneficial, and believed that the inspector, frequently the most suitable person to "cry" the tobacco, should not be prohibited from auctioning the hogsheads at his own warehouse.¹⁸

In the same legislature an unsuccessful effort was made to separate the two functions which the inspector was exercising, the original one of inspecting and the newly assumed one of selling, by the creation of a new state officer as auctioneer.¹⁹ The act which finally resulted from the agitation ignored the inspectors' appropriation of a new part,²⁰ and by default of additional

¹⁷ *Journal Virginia House of Delegates*, 1825-26, 141 and Appendix [375-376].

¹⁸ "Letter from James Caskie to a Member of the Legislature of Virginia," *Richmond Enquirer*, Feb. 9, 1826. Caskie was later president of the Bank of Virginia. J. A. Caskie, *The Caskie Family of Virginia*, 27, 41 ([Charlottesville, Va., 1928]).

¹⁹ The original proposal was aimed at the Richmond situation. The preamble read, "And whereas, a great portion of planters of tobacco, brought to the Inspections in the city of Richmond, is disposed of by public sale at the warehouses . . ." *Journal Virginia House of Delegates*, 1825-26, Appendix [447], sec. 14 of "A Bill, To Amend an act entitled, 'an act to reduce into one the several acts now in force concerning the Inspection of Tobacco.'"

²⁰ *Acts of Virginia Assembly*, 1825-26, ch. 14.

legislation they continued their selling, disregarding the prohibitory features already in the law.

Occasionally others than inspectors took the rôle of auctioneer and agent at a warehouse; witness the case of H. B. Montague, who presented himself at the Richmond Public Warehouse in 1827. In one of his advertisements, with the preamble "AS it has become almost the universal custom to sell nearly the whole of the Tobacco brought to this market at Auction", he boasted of his own integrity in a way which inferentially slurred the honesty of rival auctioneers as well as that of buyers: "I will only remark, that I shall never feel myself at liberty to knock out tobacco (however much I may be urged by the buyers) while there is a prospect of a bid; as public salesman, the subscriber's best exertions, to obtain the highest prices, are respectfully tendered."²¹

Selling tobacco by auction became firmly established, as did the practice by inspectors of participating in the sale when they had opportunity. With the revisal of the Virginia laws in 1849, the old prohibitory section customarily violated was continued, but with the addition of a proviso which recognized the *fait accompli*. The inspectors' victory in custom now had legal sanction. Note the second sentence in the new phraseology: "If any inspector shall directly or indirectly buy, or sell, stem or manufacture, any tobacco inspected at his warehouse, (other than tobacco grown on his own plantation,) he shall forfeit ten dollars for every hundred pounds of tobacco so bought, sold stemmed or manufactured. But this section shall not prohibit any inspector from acting as crier or agent for any owner in selling tobacco by auction at his warehouse."²²

Added to his fees provided by law, the inspector received $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents for each hogshead which he sold as public crier, and \$1.00 for each which he sold as agent, or "commission merchant."²³ Naturally the regularly licensed commission merchants, operating on a standard $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent fee, resented this cut-rate competition from a state officer whose original function had been that of an impartial judge.

²¹ *Richmond Enquirer*, Nov. 16, 1827.

²² *Virginia Code of 1849*, ch. 87, sec. 41; *Virginia Code of 1860*, ch. 87, sec. 38.

²³ *Southern Planter*, 18:389 (1858).

A feature which was needed to make the ante-bellum warehouse similar to the modern was the sale of loose tobacco, tobacco cured but not prized into the traditional hogsheads. Certainly by the early 1830's, and probably before then, new loose tobacco was being brought to market and taken by local manufacturers for immediate use and by an occasional rehandler who packed it into hogsheads. At the 1833-34 session of the Virginia General Assembly, in recognition of "the growing traffic in unprized or loose tobacco, carried on in towns or elsewhere, without being either inspected or weighed at the public warehouses", an attempt was made to force the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of loose tobacco at or near the public inspections.²⁴ At the next session the town of Lynchburg received permission to appoint weighers of loose tobacco,²⁵ and the 1841-42 Assembly, while establishing an inspection at Centre warehouse in Petersburg, specifically required that a portion of the building be set aside for the reception of loose tobacco.²⁶ Obviously the traffic in loose tobacco spread to all inspections. Finally, in the 1849 Virginia Code the custom found legal sanction in the requirement that all inspectors receive, weigh and inspect such unprized tobacco as was submitted to them.²⁷ Thus loose tobacco gained formal admission to the warehouses where it became part of the auction system already established for prized tobacco.

The supply of loose tobacco steadily increased, and just before the Civil War the amount sold in the principal market centers fluctuated in weight between one-fourth and one-fifth of the entire Virginia hogshead inspections.²⁸ Since loose tobacco sale allowed the omission of the last laborious phases in plantation manage-

²⁴ *Journal Virginia House of Delegates*, 1833-34, Bill No. 9. See also Bill No. 10, allowing inspection of loose but preventing sale without warehouse certificate within twenty miles of an inspection. Both bills were tabled. For early newspaper notices of loose tobacco sales see *Richmond Enquirer*, Nov. 6, 13, 20, 27, 1835.

²⁵ *Acts of Virginia Assembly*, 1834-35, ch. 177, sec. 2.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1841-42, ch. 139, sec. 4.

²⁷ *Virginia Code of 1849*, ch. 87, sec. 25; *Virginia Code of 1860*, ch. 87, sec. 22.

²⁸ See *Southern Planter*, 12:362 (1852); *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, 40: 343 (1859); *Richmond Whig* as quoted in the *Tobacco Plant*, Clarksville, Va., Oct. 19, 1860.

ment, marketing was effected in the late fall, winter and early spring; thus began a movement which eventually was to draw the marketing period a half-year nearer the actual harvesting. Through the ante-bellum period, however, first-hand sale in hogsheads continued the typical mode and accordingly the major marketing months were in the late spring and summer.²⁹

During the 1850's Richmond steadily increased her lead as the largest market for Virginia-North Carolina tobacco until by the end of the decade one-half of all tobacco grown in the two states was being sold in Richmond, as compared with one-fifth in Petersburg and one-seventh in Lynchburg, her nearest rivals.³⁰ The system of warehouse auction sales became exceedingly offensive to Richmond commission merchants and buyers, especially the former, in the 1850's. In the first place, both commission merchants and buyers objected to the tediously long breaks which included an actual sampling of each hogshead, and to the weary trek from warehouse to warehouse, a situation aggravated by the ever-increasing concentration of selling in the capital city. In the second place, the regular commission merchants were angered at the commission business which inspectors enjoyed. One of the Richmond inspectors declared in 1858 that "he and his brother Inspectors represented *at least* one fourth of the Planters who send their tobacco to this market."³¹ The commission merchants charged, and presented witnesses in proof, that time and again inspectors favored tobacco consigned to themselves over that presented through commission merchants.³²

Both the difficulty of widely separated sales over the city and the evil of inspectors acting as commission merchants would be alleviated by establishing a central sales room. Accordingly on

²⁹ Certainly from about 1825 to 1860 the typical marketing period was from May through August. See especially *Richmond Enquirer*, Mar. 31, 1831; *Petersburg Express* as quoted in *Daily Dispatch*, Richmond, Jan. 4, 1860; J. B. Killebrew, "Report on the Culture and Curing of Tobacco in the United States," *U. S. Census of 1880*, 3:804; general comments in newspapers of the time and in *A. G. Hancock Papers* (MSS. Duke University Library.)

³⁰ *Richmond Whig* as quoted in the *Tobacco Plant*, Clarksville, Va., Oct. 19, 1860, compared with production as given in *U. S. Census of 1860*, reduced to hogsheads at the usual 1,400 lbs. equivalent.

³¹ *Southern Planter*, 18:392 (1858).

³² *Ibid.*, 17:441 (1857).

Wednesday, May 26, 1858, the Richmond Tobacco Exchange was formally opened, where buyers and commission merchants congregated for the sale of tobacco by sample, the hogsheads having been opened and left in the warehouses.³³ As originally planned, the Tobacco Exchange was to have taken all of the sales away from the warehouses, though the legal inspection was to continue, for at the official break the sample was extracted. A week after its foundation the Richmond Tobacco Exchange was declared a "fixed institution."³⁴

Naturally the Richmond inspectors, for a generation profiting as intermediaries in the sale of tobacco and only recently having obtained explicit legal recognition of their rôles, were the first to object to the Exchange. Colonel McDearmon, inspector at Shockoe Warehouse and the most vigorous opponent of the new institution, declared that he and his fellows were required by law to sell at their warehouses tobacco sent to their care.³⁵ As has been pointed out, the legislation to which he referred was at most only a recognition of an assumed privilege, and was merely permissive in its nature.

In addition to inspectors, many planters objected to the Exchange from the time of its earliest suggestion. The Bush and Briery Agricultural Club of Prince Edward County led in resistance from rural districts. Fearing that the Exchange aimed at transferring supervision of all sales from the planter to the commission merchant the members by unanimous resolution sturdily vowed that while they might use merchants *at their own option*, they would not be compelled to do so against their will.³⁶ To ward off such criticism, the Tobacco Exchange, on the very day of the

³³ *Daily Dispatch*, Richmond, May 25, 27, 1858; *Southern Planter*, 18:469-471 (1858). Vigorous agitation for the Richmond Tobacco Exchange dated from June, 1857. *Daily Dispatch*, Richmond, June 15, 1857; *Southern Planter*, 17:440-441 (1857).

³⁴ *Daily Dispatch*, June 1, 1858.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, May 26, 1858.

³⁶ There were other resolutions, one of them asking for coöperation "in resisting this violation of the long and well-established usage of the country." *Daily Dispatch*, June 2, 1858; *Southern Planter*, 18:387 (1858). For further Bush and Briery Club condemnation of the Exchange see *Southern Planter*, 18:471-472, 570-573 (1858). For other rural objections see *ibid.*, 17:620-623 (1857); *American Farmer* (n.s.), 14:40-41 (1858).

Bush and Briery resolution, agreed to a rule which allowed the planter to attend and to have his tobacco sold by the Exchange auctioneer for 12½ cents per hogshead, the same fee which had been allowed the inspector when confined to his auctioneering activities.³⁷

The Richmond *Daily Dispatch* attempted to soothe the rural section, and the *Southern Planter* vigorously defended the Tobacco Exchange. Justification of the Exchange gave an opportunity to air long-standing complaints against the inspector and the inspection system. It was pointed out that the selection of inspectors was merely a phase of political patronage, that their decision as to quality gave no tangible benefit as buyers let it influence their judgment not one whit, and that it was a contradiction to expect inspectors to be impartial judges as originally intended as well as agents for one party in the trade.³⁸ The *Southern Planter* showed that even without fees from auctioneering and agency, the inspectors made handsome wages, and stated that commission merchants, with the choice of several modes of sale, had advantages over inspectors, who could only sell by auction at their own warehouses.³⁹

Though the "large majority of Planters" were congratulated for acquiescing in the reform,⁴⁰ it was but natural that many looked with suspicion on the innovation, revolutionary in its suddenness as compared with the evolutionary warehouse auction sale system.

Richmond inspectors continued to sell at the warehouses such tobacco as was consigned to them, the purchasers being those who still made the laborious rounds. After two heavy marketing months had passed, the inspectors requested the *Daily Dispatch* to contradict a report circulating to the effect that their sales were not generally attended by buyers.⁴¹ Even after the Exchange had been in operation for nine months, the inspectors of Shockoe Warehouse advertised that attendance of buyers was as

³⁷ *Daily Dispatch*, May 25, 1858; *Southern Planter*, 18:469 (1858).

³⁸ *Daily Dispatch*, June 2, 1858; *Southern Planter*, 18:387-393, 467-469 (1858).

³⁹ *Southern Planter*, 18:389-390 (1858).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 18:393 (1858).

⁴¹ *Daily Dispatch*, July 30, 1858.

full as ever.⁴² On the other hand, so prosperous and successful was the Exchange that a Tobacco Exchange Building was erected in 1860. On January 28, 1861, the new Exchange was opened; and, in the words and italics of a contemporary Richmond wit, the trading for the initial day was very *spirited* being *stimulated* by brimmers of apple toddy.⁴³

Establishing the Richmond Tobacco Exchange was the only serious attack on the Virginia warehouse auction system in places where once that mode of selling was practiced. But even in the inspection warehouses sellers or their agents did not always patronize the public auction. That method might be tried, the offering withdrawn when bids were insufficient, and the tobacco eventually sold by private negotiations. An appreciable business was done by sample within the counting rooms of commission merchants. These "indoor" sales, as they were called to distinguish them from the regular warehouse business, included the disposition of a large number of hogsheads sent from one market to another for resale; they enjoyed most patronage out of the regular season for large warehouse breaks.⁴⁴

In many small town and country districts selling was informal and not connected with the state warehouse inspection system. There might be a sale direct to a country merchant in settlement of an account,⁴⁵ a public street auction,⁴⁶ or a private bargain at a planter's curing barn.⁴⁷ Most frequently in the last thirty years of the ante-bellum period extra-warehouse trading was in

⁴² *Ibid.*, Feb. 15, 1859.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, Jan. 18, 29, 1861; *Richmond Daily Examiner*, May 10, 1860.

⁴⁴ *A. G. Hancock Papers*, John Jones to A. G. Hancock, Richmond, July 27, Aug. 3, 1847; Preston and Enders to A. G. Hancock, Richmond, May 23, 1849, July 16, 1850; John Jones & Co. to A. G. Hancock, Richmond, Sept. 15, 1849.

⁴⁵ This was more common the first of the nineteenth century than later, and more characteristic of the country than the town. See Tatham, *op. cit.*, 95; *Southern Planter*, 12:364 (1852); John Hartwell Cocke, *Tobacco, the Bane of Virginia Husbandry*, 23 (Richmond, 1860). Note for the North Carolina situation, J. D. Cameron, *A Sketch of the Tobacco Interests of North Carolina*, 82 (Oxford, N. C., 1881); H. V. Paul, *History of the Town of Durham, N. C.*, 93-94 (Raleigh, 1884).

⁴⁶ *Danville Appeal* as quoted in *Richmond Daily Examiner*, May 18, 1860; Cameron, *op. cit.*, 67.

⁴⁷ Edward Pollock, *Illustrated Sketch Book of Danville, Virginia*, 33 ([Danville] 1885); Cocke, *op. cit.*, 9.

loose tobacco bought by manufacturers from planters. This type of sale was especially prevalent in the Dan River section, land of numerous small factories.⁴⁸ Manufacturers in Danville and vicinity, where few establishments were over medium size, were purchasing loose tobacco almost exclusively by 1850 and this without the aid of the official warehouses.⁴⁹

Likewise warehouse auctioning was rare in the North Carolina piedmont counties contiguous to Virginia, a region economically a part of the Virginia tobacco district. None of the North Carolina tobacco markets were significant as most of the leaf from that state went to swell the trade of Virginia towns. Milton alone made appreciable use of the warehouse auction system.⁵⁰

From about 1810, or even earlier, to the founding of the Richmond Tobacco Exchange in 1858 the larger part of the Virginia-North Carolina crop experienced first-hand sale within the official warehouses, and during most of the period warehouse sale was typically accompanied by the auction system. With the crystallization of the auction system within the official inspection warehouse the building became, instead of a place for the state's decision as to the quality of tobacco, a place primarily for sale of the leaf.

⁴⁸ *Daily Dispatch*, Oct. 3, 1855.

⁴⁹ *Southern Planter*, 10:367-368 (1850).

⁵⁰ Cameron, *op. cit.*, 82; Paul, *op. cit.*, 93.

SOCIAL AND AGRARIAN BACKGROUND OF THE PILGRIM FATHERS

G. E. FUSSELL

The natural starting point in a consideration of the social and agrarian background of the Pilgrim Fathers is the location of the places or districts from which the passengers on the *Mayflower* originated, and the ascertaining of their social status and occupations.¹ The farming of these localities was their agrarian background, and it supplied them with the resources in technique on which they relied when they founded homes in the wilderness of New England. Some doubt has been cast upon their ability as pioneers and farmers, but this doubt is by no means justified. It is true enough, largely because it was the only possibility, that "In all the earliest settlements, and particularly in the ill-equipped Plymouth Colony, the indigenous plants and the wild animals were largely relied upon as food resources until the first crops could be harvested . . .,"² but it is extremely doubtful whether middle-class Englishmen as a whole or the Pilgrim Fathers in particular "knew little of sport" and that "In England and in Holland, not one of them probably had ever gone in pursuit of a wild animal, and few, if any had ever caught a fish."³

¹ In this article Mr. Fussell has used Pilgrim Fathers to mean only the emigrants who sailed on the *Mayflower* in 1620. Although this is the most specific application of the term his findings would be applicable if it were used in a more general sense. See footnote 8. However, the enterprises of the Massachusetts Bay Company were better equipped, and its promoters at least were perhaps drawn from rather different classes. In connection with this study of the Pilgrim Fathers, see the article by G. E. Fussell and V. G. B. Atwater, "Agriculture of Rural England in the Seventeenth Century," *Economic Geography*, 9: 379-394 (October, 1933).—*Editor*.

² Percy Wells Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*, 5 (Washington, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1925).

³ *Ibid.*, 6, citing Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 1:310 (New York, Macmillan Co., 1905). Cf. Bidwell and Falconer, 8,—"The task of clearing heavily wooded land was especially formidable to the European immigrants, unskilled in woodcraft."

A similar view is taken by another contemporary American writer who practically accuses William Bradford of perversion in the use of words. He says, "The Pilgrims came to America in 1620 with their families intending to make their homes in America. That they did not properly appreciate the importance at first of developing the agricultural resources is evidenced by their neglecting to bring any horses, sheep or cattle with them. Perhaps they would have provided these animals if the Mayflower had been a larger ship and their wealth sufficient to buy them. The Pilgrims had little practical farm experience before coming to America although 'used to a plaine countrie life and y^e ino-cente trade of husbandrey' before migrating to Holland."⁴ The quoted sentence indicates that they were mainly farmers, and Bradford was not a man whose statements are likely to have been equivocal.

The character and social status of the Pilgrims has perhaps been most aptly described by Henry Martyn Dexter and his son, Morton.

The men who constituted the nucleus of the movement . . . were mostly in the common walks of life. They had inborn intelligence, good sense, solid habits of industry, frugality and self-reliance, and such rude education as was within their reach. Above all they had a regnant conscience. But not many were of 'gentle blood.' Few seem to have been landowners. They had not even that expansion of the faculties apt to be bred by the aims and risks of commerce. In the main they were plain farmers whose names, excepting in a line or two upon the parish parchments at birth, marriage and burial, seldom went upon record. Hence the difficulty, after 300 years, of identifying them precisely.⁵

It is, therefore, sufficiently difficult to place them, but we have been provided with an estimate of the number from the different counties.

The question may seem simple enough to some investigators, but although a hundred persons at Scrooby "obtained leave to go

⁴ Lyman Carrier, *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America*, 138 (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1923). The quoted phrase is from William Bradford, *History of Plymouth*, 16 (Boston, 1898).

⁵ Henry Martyn Dexter and Morton Dexter, *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*, 379 (Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905). Hereafter this work is cited as Dexter.

to Leyden" in 1608, it is by no means true to say that the growing Separatist movement or "the little part of it which concerns us began in the early years of the seventeenth century in the country about the three counties of Nottingham, Lincoln and York."⁶ The religious insurrection of which the Pilgrims were a part had its principal support from individuals of the yeoman and working classes in widely separated localities. Of the one hundred and thirty-seven persons who sailed in the *Mayflower*, the largest number from any individual county was thirty-two from Norfolk, and seventeen from Kent and London respectively. So far as can now be ascertained the actual number from each district was: from the north of England, 4 (Durham, 1; Scotland, 3); from the east of England, 68 (East Riding of York, 5; Norfolk, 32; Suffolk, 3; Essex, 11; Kent, 17); from the Midlands, 24 (remainder of Yorks, 6; Lincoln, 2; Notts, 9; Cambridge, 3; Leicester, 1; Berkshire, 2; Wilts, 1); from the south of England, 10 (Somerset, 5; Dorset, 1; Sussex, 3; Hampshire, 1); from London, 17; uncertain, probably Notts, Norfolk, Suffolk, or Kent, 14. The Dexters granted that this classification is necessarily very imperfect,⁷ but subsequent investigators have not made any additions.⁸

⁶ John Masefield, *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*, introduction (Everyman's Library ed. London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1910).

⁷ Dexter, 649-650.

⁸ See Charles Edward Banks, *The English Ancestry and Homes of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 1-4 (New York, Grafton Press [1929]). Also the same author's article, "English Sources of Emigration to the New England Colonies in the Seventeenth Century," in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings* (1926-27) 60:366-373; also his article, "The Topographical Sources of English Emigration to the New England Colonies, 1620-1650," in *New York Genealogical and Biographical Bulletin*, 61:3-6 (January, 1930). In this connection a summary of the conclusions in the latter article are of interest. Having analyzed the topographic sources of English emigration to the New England colonies during 1620-1650, Banks found that East Anglia (Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex) gave 670 emigrants or 21.5 percent; London, Middlesex, Sussex, and Kent, 530 or 20 percent; and the West Country (Dorset, Devon, Somerset, and Cornwall), 424 or 16 percent, making a total of 57 percent from the counties bordering on the North Sea and the English Channel from The Wash to the Bristol Channel. The Home Counties (Bedford, Berks, Bucks, Herts, and Surrey) surrounding London supplied 295 emigrants or 11 percent, and the Midlands (Leicester, Notts, Northants, Worcester, Warwick, and Derby), 250 or 9 percent. Four-fifths of all the English who migrated to New England during 1620-1650 originated south of a line drawn from the Bristol Chan-

It serves to show that the Pilgrims were drawn from a large number of widely dispersed districts, and that their provenance covered nearly the whole of England. For that reason, it is necessary to supply some general idea of the entire country rather than details of a particular district or region.

Fortunately, the period is one which has captivated the imaginations of historical investigators, and consequently there are a number of modern works on the subject, although their main source of information is William Harrison's *Description*. The total population of England and Wales was probably not more than three or four million at the highest computation, and the country as a whole was largely unsettled and certainly unreclaimed.

Probably not above a quarter of the land was cultivated, the remainder being woods, moors, fens, commons and parks or warrens. Of the forty counties in England but fifteen were destitute of forests, some of which, like Sherwood and Dean, were of great extent. Moors and mosses occupied immense tracts. The fens of Lincolnshire were famous resorts of wild fowl. Already some plans had been made for the reclamation of boggy tracts, which soon came to trial on a larger scale. Common lands abounded. There were comparatively few fences, ploughed fields being separated by balks of earth. Where arable land had been turned into pasture there were enclosures, excepting when hundreds of acres were grazed by flocks guarded by a shepherd with his dog. In every shire, moreover, were numerous parks and warrens. The Crown alone had nearly two hundred. . . . The number of rabbit-warrens was almost beyond computation.

The highways afforded passage and offered safety in degrees differing with locality, most, on leaving thickly settled territory, degenerating quickly into mere cart or bridle paths. . . . In many regions the ordinary routes had become so defective as to almost interdict inland traffic. Morasses had to be floundered through and rocks and rough places evaded or overcome.⁹

There were few bridges over the rivers and streams except where they were maintained by private persons or by the ecclesiastics,

nel to The Wash. Cf. George Macaulay Trevelyan, *History of England*, 437 (London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1929). He says: "Of about 25,000 English settled in New England in 1640, it has been calculated by some statisticians and genealogists that fifty per cent. came from Suffolk, Essex and Herts; twenty per cent. from Norfolk, Lincolnshire, Nottingham, Yorkshire, Middlesex, Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The counties on the Welsh and Scottish borders supplied only scattered individuals. These original 25,000, to whom collectively may be extended the term 'Pilgrim Fathers,' were a prolific stock. . . ."—*Editor*.

⁹ Dexter, 10-11.

although this was a matter which lay within the purview of shire authorities. The work of reclamation and enclosure which has changed the surface of the major part of the country was carried out in the two and one-half centuries which followed the departure of the Pilgrims.

Outside of the town the land largely was unenclosed. At intervals of from two to four miles would be a parish church, with a few cottages, and not far away the manor-house of the squire, who perhaps owned most of the land within sight. His dwelling ordinarily would be of two stories, the upper often overhanging the lower, built of brick or stone; or it might be framed of strong timbers with studs from four to nine inches apart filled in with stones and clay, coated with white-washed plaster and roofed with tiles or slates. A few years only had elapsed since even the costliest dwellings had depended for windows upon lattice-work pieced out with horn or oiled paper. Glass, although imported for churches and palaces, hardly had become common.

The rooms of the mansion often would be lofty and spacious, and would have the walls hung with tapestry, or wainscoted with native oak. The domestic offices and farm buildings would be near but not under the same roof; excepting sometimes in the north, where necessity urged most shelter from least material. The better residences of country gentlemen included a large hall and a chapel. The yeoman's home had several rooms, and was roofed with reeds. The cottages of laborers usually were of clay walls upon a timber frame, thatched with straw, windowed with one or two lattices, and seldom including more than two rooms.¹⁰

At this time the population of England could be divided into four classes,—gentlemen, citizens or burgesses, yeomen, and artificers or laborers. The term gentleman included all landed proprietors and some other classes, and we are not here interested in the citizens or burgesses. Of the other two classes we have a valuable and succinct contemporary description.

Yeomen are those, which by our law are called *Legales homines*, free men borne English, and may dispend of their owne free land in yearelie reuenuue, to the summe of fortie shillings sterling, [or six pounds as monie goeth in our times . . .] This sort of people haue a certeine preheminance, and more estimation than labourers & [the common sort of] artificers, & [these] commonlie liue wealhtilie, keepe good

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9. Cf. D. H. Atkinson, *Ralph Thoresby, the Topographer; His Town and Times*, 1:62 (Leeds, Walker and Laycock, 1885-87). "The house in Kirkgate had been built by his grandfather in the reign of James the First, when, as Ralph Thoresby says, in Leeds brick was scarcely known. Alderman Metcalf's triple-roofed mansion at the West Bar, which still bears the name of Red Hall being the first brick house built in the town, dates from 1628; but brick building in Leeds seems to have made little or no progress for the next fifty years."

houses, and trauell to get riches. They are also for the most part farmers to gentlemen . . . & with grasing, frequenting of markets, and keeping of seruantes (not idle seruants as the gentlemen doo, but such as get both their owne and part of their masters liuing) do come to great welth, in somuch that manie of them are able and doo buie the lands of vnthrifitie gentlemen, and often setting their sonnes to the schooles, to the vniuersities, and to the Ins of the court; or otherwise leauing them sufficient lands wherevpon they may liue without labour, doo make them by those means to become gentlemen. . . .

The fourth and last sort of people in England are daie labourers, poore husbandmen, and some retailers (which haue no free land) copie holders, and all artificers, as tailers, shomakers, carpenters, brickmakers, masons, &c. As for slaues and bondmen we haue none . . . This [fourth and last sort of people] therefore haue neither voice nor authoritie in the common wealth, but are to be ruled, and not to rule other: yet they are not altogether neglected, for in cities and corporat townes, for default of yeomen, they are faine to make vp their inquests of such maner of people. And in villages they are commonlie made churchwardens, sidemen, aleconners, [now and then] constables, and manie times inioie the name of hedboroughes.¹¹

The village communities were small and, although the different social classes were quite clearly defined, there was a measure of intimacy between the individuals composing these isolated and self-contained societies that is perhaps nowhere paralleled in modern times. The method of parish government had a deal to do with this. As Harrison pointed out, the villagers were all liable to be made churchwardens, and those officers, with the clergyman, rector, vicar or curate, and the squire formed the village hierarchy. The visits of the archdeacon and the bishop made them feel their responsibilities to outside jurisdiction and much of the civil administration of the parish was undertaken by these officials acting under the authority of the ecclesiastical courts. This authority intervened at every major crisis of a villager's life and in most of the minor happenings. Indeed, if there were no minor happenings it often obtained them in order to exercise its functions.

. . . They compelled him to attend on specified days his parish church, and no other; to be married there; to have his children baptized and his wife churched

¹¹ William Harrison, *Harrison's Description of England in Shakspeare's Youth; Being the Second and Third Books of His Description of Britaine and England*, edited by Frederick James Furnivall, 1:132-134 (London, Published for the New Shakspeare Society by N. Trübner & Co., 1877-81). Cf. *ibid.*, 105, 132, and also Dexter, 4-6.

there; to receive a certain number of times communion there; to contribute to the maintenance of church and churchyard, as well as to the finding of requisites for service or the church ornaments or utensils. In his parish church he and his children were catechized and instructed, and, if the latter were taught in a neighboring school-house, it was under the strict supervision of the ordinary and by his or the bishop's licence and allowance. So true was this that the schoolmaster was, like the parson, a church officer. For the parishioner his church was the place of business where all local affairs, civil or ecclesiastical, were transacted, as well as the centre of social life in the village . . . he and his fellow-warden were held responsible by the official.¹²

Perhaps, therefore, the revolt of the Puritans was something more than a demand for liberty of worship and was subconsciously a rebellion against a type of tyranny which had become outgrown.

At the same time the relations of all the inhabitants of the village, whatever their social status, were friendly and intimate.

The feudal lord, still a sovereign on his own estate, was generally regarded with affectionate respect by his yeomen, tenants, and his crowds of serving-men. He did not disdain to appear as the village rival; he gave a fat buck to the rustic bridal; he was the friend and patron of all; the old hall was the County Court; its owner was neither feared nor dreaded; the young squire led his tenants to the Low Countries; the old knight's daughter was the cynosure of the county and the gem of the Court; holidays were frequent and work light.¹³

On the last point there is ground for dissent, but otherwise the sketch of the squire's relation with the villagers is accurate as well as picturesque. The farmer was sketched by Thornbury as follows:

Rude, but hearty in manner, the Elizabethan farmer was one of a distinct class strongly divided from either the labourer or the gentleman. He could not pass beyond the boundaries of his class, and he did not wish to do it; he could hawk and hunt, attend the fairs, and occasionally visit London, but he never thought

¹² Sedley Lynch Ware, *The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, v. 26, no. 7-8), 51 (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1908). Cf. John Charles Cox, *Churchwardens' Accounts from the Fourteenth Century to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (London, Methuen & Co., 1913); Eleanor Trotter, *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish*, 178 (Cambridge, England, University Press, 1919).

¹³ George Walter Thornbury, *Shakspeare's England; or, Sketches of Our Social Life in the Reign of Elizabeth*, 2:229 (London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1856). Hereafter this work is cited as Thornbury.

of rivalling the lord of the manor. He was generally superstitious and a great respecter of old customs.¹⁴

Although the expressed opinion of the day was that the farmers were growing more wealthy than they had ever been, and definite evidence of their possessions is given in support of the contention,¹⁵ Thornbury says, "The farmer has no Flemish tapestry or Dutch linen; he drinks from bowls, and has but a plain table board and little plate; his bed is flax, and his curtains of home-spun wool; his coat of frieze or Kendal-green; he has two doublets, and not often more than two servants."¹⁶

The cottager and laborer would have aroused little discussion either contemporaneously or among modern historians had it not been that large numbers of his class were unemployed and formed the subject of legislation and constant vigilance on the part of local authorities. In theory, a man of this class was as much a prisoner in his parish as if he had been born a slave. In it he had his settlement, the legal theory of which became more emphatic with the passage of time, and he was unable to travel, even in search of work, without a pass signed by the parish clergy or other officer and a reference from his last employer. If he did so he was hounded back to his parish because no other wished to be responsible for his maintenance as there was every chance of his becoming a burden on the rates. Nevertheless, there were many vagrants, both licensed and unlicensed, and they formed not only a source of apprehension to the authorities, but also a very real social menace.¹⁷ Not all the poor who depended upon charity, both official and unofficial, were of this type. Many were domiciled strictly in their own place. In 1615, Sheffield had "a total population of 2207 persons. Of these 725 were 'begging poore,' unable to live without charity."¹⁸

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 243-244.

¹⁵ *Harrison's Description*, 239-243.

¹⁶ Thornbury, 2:259.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 2:240-241. Cf. Arthur Valentine Judges, editor, *The Elizabethan Underworld*, xviii ff. (London, George Routledge & Sons, 1930).

¹⁸ Dexter, 7. Cf. William Paul McClure Kennedy, *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, 138 (Catholic Library, v. 9. London, Manresa Press; B. Herder, 1914).

In one of the quotations given above it was said that work was light and holidays frequent. Perhaps it may have been for the more well-to-do classes, but the average man worked from dawn to dark and sometimes much longer. A contemporary outline of a day's work can leave no doubt of this, and although it is verbose, it serves to make the picture more distinct.

... I will now briefly as I can, goe over the particular daies labours of a Farmer or Plowman, shewing the particular expence of every houre in the day, from his first rising, till his going to bed, as thus for example: we will suppose it to be after *Christmas*, and about plow-day (which is the first letting out of the Plough) and at what time men either begin to fallow, or to break up Pease earth, which is to lie to bait, according to the custome of the Country; at this time the Plough-man shall rise before foure of the clocke in the morning, and after thankes given to God for his rest, and the successe of his labours he shall goe into his stable, or beast-house, and first he shall fodder his cattell, then cleanse the house, and make the booths cleane; rub downe the cattell, and cleanse their skins from all filth, then hee shall curry his horses, rub them with clothes and wisps, and make both them and the stable as cleane as may be, then he shall water both his Oxen and Horses, and housing them againe, give them more fodder, and to his Horse by all meanes provender, as chaffe and dry Pease or Beanes, or Oat-hulls, Pease or Beanes or cleane Oates, or cleane garbage (which is the hinder ends of any kinde of graine but Rye) with the straw chop'd small amongst it, according as the ability of the Husbandman is.

And whilst they are eating their meat, he shall make ready his collars, hames, treats, halters, mullens, and Plough-geares, seeing everything fit, and in his due place, and to these labours I will also allow full two houres, that is, from foure of the clocke till sixe, then shall hee come into breakefast, and to that I allow him halfe an houre, and then another halfe houre to the gearing and yoking of his Cattell, so that at seven of the clocke hee may set forward to his labour, and then he shall plow from seven of clock in the morning, till betwixt two and three in the afternoone, then hee shall unyoake, and bring home his cattell, and having rubb'd them, drest them, and cleansed away all durt and filth, hee shall fodder them, and give them meate, then shall the servants goe in to their dinner, which allowed halfe an houre, it will then be towards foure of the clocke, at what time hee shall goe to his Cattell againe, and rubbing them downe, and cleansing their stalls, give them more fodder, which done, he shall goe into the Barnes, and provide and make ready fodder of all kinds for the next day, whether it be hay, straw, or blend fodder, according to the ability of the Husbandman: this being done, and carried into the stable, Oxe-house, or other convenient place, he shall then goe water his cattell, and give them more meate, and to his Horse provender, as before shewed: and by this time it will draw past sixe of the clocke, at what time he shall come in to supper, and after supper, he shall either by the fire side, mend shooes both for himselfe and their family, or beat and knock hemp, or flaxe, or picke and stampe Apples, or crabs for cider or verdjuce, or else grind Malt on the quernes, picke candle rushes, or do some husbandry office within dores, till it be full eight a

clocke: Then shall he take his Lanthorne and candle, and goe to his cattell, and having cleansed the stalls and plankes, litter them downe, looke that they be safely tied, and then fodder and give them meat for all night, then giving God thanks for benefits received that day, let him and the whole houshold goe to their rest till the next morning.¹⁹

Nor were the women workers of the villages in any better case.

The life of the female farming servant was hard: she rose early, and having cleaned the house, sat down to pick hemp, twine rushes, salt meat, or spin and card wool. Some looked to the cattle, others went milking or ground malt for the brewer; the breakfast was hurried and taken in the dark. . . She had to bake and brew, make candles, wash, and cook; the poorest turnspit had fixed and unvarying duties, and was one of a regiment. Dinner was at noon, supper before sunset. At supper the work of the next day was fixed, and the keys of the dairy, buttery, cupboard, and chest, were brought every night to the good man. Countrymen went to bed in winter at nine, in summer at ten; but rose in winter at five, in summer at four.²⁰

If there was carting to be done these people had to rise as early as two o'clock. These general conditions continued until well into the nineteenth century.²¹

The farmer himself, though living a life which included rustic pleasures and sports, found his duties continuous throughout the day.

. . . he rises at cock-crow, says his prayers, and gives his servants their charges; he then goes out, ascends some breezy hill, and looks over his flocks, and surveys if all is well with his cattle both for pail and plough; at eleven or twelve he returns to dine, drinking no wine, and leaving tobacco for rich people. In the afternoon he reads Fox or Hollinsed's *Chronicles* [a possible but not generally probable occupation!]; and the night is spent talking of courses of husbandry, in hearing the bailiff give an account of his day's stewardship, or listening to some stranger's discourse of foreign parts.

Tom Nash, the bitterest of lampooners, gives us a sketch of country life and farmers' pleasures. As a youth he was fond of throwing at the stone or leaping, handsomely rising at the pommado, and the bear leap. Sometimes he ran in matches, sometimes practised the Cornish hug, or Norfolk twitch and trippet in wrestling; sometimes he was all for fencing, or play with single sword, or rapier, and dagger, long staff or two-handed glaive. Not unseldom, if it were May, the country squire's son would betake himself to the common green, and watch Tib

¹⁹ Gervase Markham *Farewell to Husbandry*, 144-146 (4th ed. London, 1638). The 1st edition appeared in 1620.

²⁰ Thornbury, 2:270-271.

²¹ William Howitt, *The Rural Life of England*, 1:161-164 (London, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1838).

and Tom dancing a measure about the Maypole; then he was all for riding, and at fifteen he could make the great horse ~~reed~~ and trot, and gallop the ring, leaving caroches (coaches) for aged and impotent people. . . .

Tomorrow, perhaps, he was angling, or gardening, or snaring birds, or shooting from bush to bush, to keep up his use of the bow; in the evening, perhaps, on the common green at bowls.²²

This must have applied, however, only to the squires and the more well-to-do farmers. The small holders who were the majority must have worked as hard as the laborers and had as little time for recreation, although everyone was obliged to practise at the bow after seven years of age. The laborers or servants were not allowed to indulge in games or pastimes unless by the permission, or in the presence, of the master.²³

Beyond the long hours of labor, the restrictions upon their liberty of movement and the general and meticulous surveillance to which they were subjected, the laborers, who formed a large proportion of the inhabitants of the seventeenth-century villages, do not seem to have been in an unfavorable position.

They were not wholly dependent on their wages, indeed every labourer might be called a farmer on a small scale.

He grew on the four acres of land which was laid to his cottage enough barley or maslin to provide bread for his family. He had rights on the common for his cattle and a small enclosed garth or croft at the back of his cottage for his young stock. In the spring he could tether his cows on the balks, of the common fields and turn them out in the stubble in the autumn. When his stock increased and he required more land he could buy cowgates or calfgates from a neighbouring farmer. In some places the labourers received part of their wages in kind. The shepherd had the right to pasture so many sheep on his master's land; the husbandman had a measure of corn and so much land allotted on which to sow it; the neatherd had the milk of a cow and pasture for her.²⁴

Apart from the idea that the Statute²⁵ which demanded that no new cottage should be erected without having four acres allotted to it was always carried out, this is probably a fair picture of the laborer's condition. Although presentments for erecting cottages without attaching the regulation four acres can be found,

²² Thornbury, 2:259-261.

²³ H. Bayard Sheppard, "Courts Leet and the Court Leet of the Borough of Taunton," *Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society*, 1909.

²⁴ Trotter, 139-140; Cf. Ware, 92-93.

²⁵ 31 Elizabeth c. 7.

and although village policy required that each man should be able to maintain himself and his family, there is reason to believe that the provisions of the Statute were often neglected and that in reality the laborer who occupied four acres of land was the exception rather than the rule. It may also be asked whether his arduous day would have left him leisure or physical ability to work this land, and his wife and children could hardly have been entirely responsible for it.

Society was primitive in the extreme, and living conditions were rough and ready as well as self-centered, owing to isolation and the difficulties of communication. Under the circumstances the system of farming employed could be little other than traditional. A partisan writer has said that the advance of farming technique stopped with the dissolution of the monasteries because the monks had been in the van and that it was only in the early seventeenth century that there was a new stirring because of the circulation of printed books.²⁶ Most of the writers who have dealt with the technique of farming have been content to summarize Tusser's calendar and give the succession of works for each month of the year in a paragraph or two, but Tusser was, of course, an example of the high farming of his day, and a more successful writer than practical farmer. The best modern general description of farming has come from the pen of the learned Lord Ernle. With reference to this period he has pointed out that the demesne farm was often let and that assart land was being and had been reclaimed from the waste either legally or by force of might and formed into compact holdings which could be let for a money rent. It is impossible to do better than to quote him somewhat extensively.

At the beginning of the Tudor period there thus existed a considerable number of tenants who, in the broad features of their tenure, resembled the tenants of to-day. Side by side with these modern farmers were the tenants of the village farm, holding and cultivating their land under a system of immemorial antiquity, which has now almost entirely disappeared. With every variety of tenure and interest, but for the most part paying money rents for the use of the land, occupiers of common-field farms were associated in a common venture for the supply of

²⁶ Kennedy, 135-136.

their own food and drink. In this agrarian association each partner, whether lord of the manor, parson, yeoman, freeholder, copyholder, tenant at will, on lease, and for life, or the occupier of a cottage to which common-field rights were attached, contributed, according to his stake in the common venture, to the cost and maintenance of the plough teams or helped with hand and tool in the operations of the farm. As with the tenure, so with the interest. The holdings varied widely in extent. But a share of average size would be eighteen acres of arable land, two acres of meadow land, and common rights for as much live-stock as the tenant could fodder in the winter.

Out of a bare, hedgeless expanse rose the cluster of timber-framed, mud-built, reed-thatched cottages, which formed the *tân*, 'town' or village. . . Round it lay a few small enclosures of permanent pasture, held in private occupation and highly prized. Sometimes a similar but larger piece of pasture was reserved for the stinted use of the commoners. In enclosures of these kinds calves were reared, beasts fattened, and field-oxen, which could not endure 'his warke to labour all daye, and then to be put to the commons or before the herdsman', were maintained in comparative luxury: . . . The permanent meadows, often called 'ings', lay in the lowest part of the land—if possible . . . along the banks of the stream. . . .

Beyond the meadows lay the arable land and the rough pasture. . . . Instead of hedges, narrow, unploughed, bush-grown strips or 'balks' of turf marked the lines of division between the three great fields and their component parts. These fields were usually cultivated on a three-course, more rarely on a two-course, sometimes on a four-course system. Every year one field lay fallow; one was under wheat or rye; the other under barley, oats, vetches, beans or pease. A third of each man's holding lay in each of the three fields. . . . From seed-time to harvest the arable land was held in separate occupation, fenced and guarded against trespassers by the village hayward, and, from seed-time till the blade showed above the soil, was protected from crows and pigeons by the crow-keeper. . . . On Lammas Day (August 12)—ten days later in the year then than now—common rights recommenced; and when once the crops were cleared and the fences removed, the live-stock of the village, tended by the common neatherd, shepherd, and swineherd, grazed over the land from harvest to seed-time.

Beyond the three arable fields lay the cow and sheep downs of the farm, bounded by acres of 'long heath, brown furze' . . . or 'tooth'd briars, sharp furzes, pricking goss and thorns' . . . , which fringed the edges of the woodlands. These wastes and woods supplied many village wants. They provided heather and fern for thatching, or bedding for the cattle, or light fuel for brewing or baking; they fed the swine with beech-mast or acorns; in winter their trimmings and loppings helped to keep the half-starved stock alive; they furnished bushes to stop gaps as well as wood for movable fences, hop poles, and implements of husbandry.

The ordinary crops grown on arable land are enumerated in Shakespeare's line [wheat, rye, barley, vetches, oats and peas, *Tempest* IV. i. 61], and the more abundant resources of the modern farmer are at once apparent. Red or white rivet wheat was recommended for light land, red or white pollard for heavy soils, great wheat for clay. The best practice was to sow wheat on a thrice-ploughed fallow. The sowing, which was broadcast by hand, generally began at the end of September or in October and was completed at latest by Hallowmas (November

1) . . . in Tudor times rye, sown early in September, and not wheat, was the bread-corn of the country. Bread made from rye, 'brown as a nut', or from a mixture of wheat and rye, was considered . . . more sustaining than bread made from wheat alone. Rye was a slower crop than wheat to ripen. It was therefore sown earlier. But it was also more hardy . . . Barley, sown on light land in March or April . . . Oats (best sown in 'the dust of March') were regarded as an exhausting crop and suspected of encouraging twitch. . . . Common-field farmers, however, preferred oxen for the plough. Oxen cost less to keep, to harness, and to shoe. They required less attendance. They were not subject to the many diseases of the horse. . . .

The only variations in cropping which the limited resources of the Elizabethan farmer could command were the various kinds of 'codware', the beans, the pease, and vetches, which produced a pod or cod. . . .

On enclosed lands some crops were grown which now are forgotten or have become entirely local. . . .

To the live-stock of a common-field farm little or no attention could be paid. The scab was rarely absent from the common-fold, or the rot from the ill-drained land. No individual owner could improve his live-stock, when all cattle and sheep of the village grazed promiscuously on the commons. Local breeds were numerous and capable of development; but under the haphazard mating of nobody's son with everybody's daughter they were dwindling in size and quality. Then as now cows were kept for milk and pigs for bacon. But the cow, a smaller animal than modern science and feeding have made her, was scarcely worth more than half the price of an ox, and according to Tusser, was less profitable than a sow. Dairy produce was increased from another source. Ewes were often milked, and six ewes gave the yield of one cow. Other animals were valued for different purposes then than at the present day. Oxen were judged by their power of draught and not by their fattening precocity. Sheep were prized for their fleeces and their leather, not for their mutton.²⁷

Wide generalizations such as these, which cover in broad detail the whole of the country, give us an idea of the position of farming, but when we try to complete it by comparing the various practices of different parts of the country, we are confronted with some difficulty. The early seventeenth century was an age of transition, and it is almost impossible to specify the places where the changes were taking place most rapidly and where they were more slow. A great deal of emphasis has been laid upon the earlier change from tillage to sheep farming. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, however, the farmers were turning to wheat once more as their cash crop because of

²⁷ R. E. Prothero (Lord Ernle), "Agriculture and Gardening," p. 349-355, in *Shakespeare's England; An Account of the Life & Manners of His Age*, edited by Sir Sidney Lee, p. 347-380 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1917).

contemporary legislation. It was not until the middle of the century that the new forage grasses and roots which made the four-course system possible were even widely discussed.

The leaders of the expedition came from the district around Serooby, and no doubt they had great influence on the entire group. Of the leaders, William Brewster lived at Serooby, although not born there, and Bradford at Austerfield; John Smyth, once a preacher at Lincoln, came from Gainsborough; and Richard Barnard had been vicar of Worksop.²⁸ The Dexters have given us an apt description of this district. "The tongue of fenny land in the midst of encompassing moors, formed by the confluence at an acute angle of gently rolling hills within eyeshot on either side, and once admirably situated for hunting—being within easy ride of the famous old Sherwood Forest of Robin Hood, on the south, and of Hatfield Chase, on the north, and itself surrounded by the natural haunts of game—lies in the parish of Serooby. . . ."²⁹

In spite of the wide areas of waste and unreclaimed land which this description implies there is no doubt that the farming of this district was improving, and it must be remembered that both squire and vicar were active and practicing farmers in those times, the former on his own land, and the latter on the glebe.

There was great diversity in the size of holdings,³⁰ ranging from the cottager's highly problematical but legal four acres to farms of well over one thousand acres while some few were even larger. The larger holdings were mainly grass land. A characteristic group of farms included in the Grafton Survey of 1619 shows that there had been little change in the size and use of the holdings since 1526. Some forty years later one hundred acres of woodland had been reclaimed and plowed.³¹

²⁸ Dexter, 354 ff.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 215-216.

³⁰ Ephraim Lipson, *An Introduction to the Economic History of England*, 2:382 (London, A. & C. Black, 1931).

³¹ Reginald Vivian Lennard, *Rural Northamptonshire under the Commonwealth; A Study Based Principally upon the Parliamentary Surveys of the Royal Estates* (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, edited by Paul Vinogradoff, v. 5, no. 10), 71-72, 80, 82 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1916).

The sizes of the holdings as cited by Lennard were: 500 acres and over, 1; 100 acres and over but less than 500 acres, 4; 60 acres and over but less than 100 acres, 5; 30 acres and over but less than 60 acres, 14; 15 acres and over but less than 30, 11; 10 acres and over but less than 15, 3; 5 acres and over but less than 10, 9; 1 acre and over but less than 5, 12; under 1 acre, 26; total, 85. These data are conclusive on the point of the four-acres Statute.

In 1689 Lord Kingston's estate in North Nottinghamshire was similarly let in holdings of all sizes.

The largest farm, Saundry Hall was 607 acres, nearly all meadow and pasture, . . . The cottages generally had small pieces of land attached to them; in Saundby Richard Ffyddall rented a cottage and 2 acres of arable for £1 13s. 4d., Widow Johnson a cottage and yard for 13s. 4d., William Daubney a cottage, 6½ acres of arable, and 5½ acres of pasture for £7 18s. 6d. A farm in Scrooby consisted of a messuage, cottage, and 113 acres of arable, meadow, and pasture, only rented for £23.³²

It is probable that the arable lands of this district were farmed on the traditional three-field system, and that the people were accustomed to the routine of the year described in Tusser's, Markham's, and M. Stevenson's *Calendars*. There were, however, some villages in the valleys of the Humber and the Trent where there were more than three fields and where the traditional equality of holdings in each field is not evident from early seventeenth century surveys, but this type of village farm is less numerous in the North Midlands than in the Southwest. The district resembled the Southeast in retaining the three-field system until the end of the sixteenth century.³³ Norfolk, a county from which a large number of the Pilgrims came, seems to have been largely enclosed, in an informal manner, before enclosing by act of Parliament had been developed, and the evidence indicates that even where the fields remained open, strips, either single or combined, had been fenced.³⁴ Such land could, of course, be used in any

³² William Henry Ricketts Curtler, "Agriculture," 2:373, in *The Victoria History of the Counties of England, Nottingham*, edited by William Page, 2:371-382 (London, Constable & Co., 1910).

³³ Howard Levi Gray, *English Field Systems*, 103 ff. (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; [etc.] 1915).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 307 ff. Cf. George Alfred Carthew, *A History, Topographical, Archaeological, Genealogical, and Biographical, of the Parishes of West and East Bradenham, with those of Necton and Holme Hale, in the County of Norfolk*, . . ., 60, 66 (Norwich, Agas H. Goose & Co., 1883).

way the farmers desired, for its enclosure liberated them from the ordinary routine of the common fields, and it is probable that was either for pasture or arable as proved most suitable or as the trend of the market demanded.³⁵ Some of the Pilgrims who came from Norfolk as well as some of those from Essex may, however, have been artificers rather than farmers for here the woollen industry was well developed, especially around Norwich and Colchester. There is little doubt that even if they were mainly occupied in industry, the society of which they formed a part was intimately acquainted with the processes of farming, and we can readily believe that they worked in the fields at harvest-time just as domestic workers did at a much later date.

Both Essex and Kent supplied a larger number of persons to the expedition than most of the other counties not yet touched upon, and both these counties were largely enclosed before the end of the sixteenth century.³⁶ Consequently, it was possible to farm as one pleased and that accounts for Thomas Tusser having tried innovations in Essex.³⁷ Although the county did not graze large flocks of sheep, its wool clip was of very fine quality. The variations in the geographical contour of the county resulted in a degree of sectional specialization. Cattle and dairy farming was practiced in the marshes; in addition to the usual tillage, hops were grown and cattle grazed in the north; the Chelmsford and Clavering district was a corn country; Walden, so famed for saffron that it came to be known as Saffron Walden, followed its specialty with barley until the land was exhausted; and Waltham, Ongar, and Becontree were surrounded by extensive woods and forests.³⁸

Kent had a large area of barren land which extended "from Winchelsey in Sussex, and that Hill there, unto the top of Rivers

³⁵ See J. G. Stewart and G. E. Fussell, "The Alternate Husbandry: A Lesson from History," Ministry of Agriculture, *Journal*, 36:214-221 (June, 1929).

³⁶ Gray, 272 ff., 387 ff.

³⁷ See his *A Hundreth Good Pointes of Husbandrie* (London, 1557, and later), and *Five Hundreth Points of Good Husbandrie* (London, 1573, and later).

³⁸ (John) Norden, *Speculi Britanniae Pars: An Historical and Chorographical Description of the County of Essex, 1594*, edited from the original manuscript, by Sir Henry Ellis, for the Camden Society, London, as its Publication 9 (Camden Society, 1840).

hill in Kent;" but it was believed that this area could be improved by the application of marl and the eradication of whins, gorse, and heather.³⁹ It was one of the first counties to raise hops, and it was famous for its orchards, while the Isle of Thanet produced much grain. Since it was an enclosed county the farmers were in a position to adopt newfangled methods, and those who lived on or near the routes of travel obtained ideas foreign to more isolated parts of the country. Here also, industry flourished, the iron-making of the Weald being well known.

Of the other counties, each of which supplied one or two passengers for the *Mayflower*, we can assume that the traditional system of farming, described in the excerpt given above, was their practice. They fall within the category of enclosed counties, the advantages of which are so eloquently praised by Walter Blith.

Consider *Hartfordshire, Essex, Kent, Surry, Sussex, Barkeshire, Hampshire, Wiltshire, Somersetshire*, and all the rest, All which not onely raise Corne for themselves but to supply that great City that Spends as much as all those Countreyes and far more: And yet no parts of *England* set at greater Rates or makes greater Advantages by Grasing, and yet the greatest part thereof upon Tillage and Corning. . . .⁴⁰

Apart from supplying London and some exporting there was little commerce in the products of early seventeenth century farming, the villagers themselves providing for their own needs. As Ernle says:

If village farmers had been obliged to buy the necessities of life or of their profession, they would have been forced to farm for profit and sell their produce. But their industry was singularly self-sufficing. Even rent was sometimes paid in corn, though much to the disadvantage of the tenants. . . Except for the payment of rent, it is surprising how little coin was used or needed in rural districts. Parishes were isolated and self-supporting. Between large towns good highways existed: but off the main lines wheeled carriages were rarely used; the drift-lanes, which led from the village to the cultivated land, ceased when the bounds of the parish were reached, and could only be called roads by an improbable courtesy. The inhabitants had little need of communication with their neighbours, still less with the outside world. The fields and the live-stock provided their neces-

³⁹ Gervase Markham, *The Enrichment of the Weald of Kent* . . . (London, 1636) 1st ed., 1620.

⁴⁰ Walter Blith, *The English Improver Improved: or a Survey of Husbandry Surveyed*, 82-83 (London, Printed for John Wright, 1652).

sary food and clothing. Whatever wood was required for building, fencing, and fuel was supplied from the wastes. Each village had its mill, and nearly every house had its oven and brewing kettle. Women spun wool into coarse cloth, and hemp into linen; men tanned their own leather. The rough tools required for cultivation of the soil, and the rude household utensils needed for the comforts of daily life, were made at home. In the long winter evenings, farmers, their sons, and their servants carved the wooden spoons, the platters, and the beechen bowls, though Harrison notices the increased use of pewter among the farming aristocracy. They fitted and riveted the bottoms to the horn mugs, or closed, in coarse fashion, the leaks in the leathern jugs. They plaited the osiers and reeds into baskets and into 'weeles' for catching fish; they fixed handles to the scythes, rakes, and other tools; cut the flails from holly or thorn, and fastened them with thongs to the staves; shaped the teeth for rakes and harrows from ash or willow, and hardened them in the fire; cut out the wooden shovels for casting the corn in the granary; fashioned ox yokes and bows, forks, racks, and rack-staves: twisted willows into scythe-cradles, or into traces and other harness gear. Travelling carpenters, smiths, and tinkers visited farmhouses and remoter villages at rare intervals to perform those parts of the work which needed their professional skill. But every village of any size found employment for such trades as those of the smith and the carpenter. . . . Meanwhile the women plaited straw or reeds for neck-collars, stitched and stuffed sheepskin bags for cart-saddles, peeled rushes for wicks and made candles. Thread was made from nettles. Spinning wheels, distaffs, and needles were never idle. Home-made cloth and linen supplied all wants. . . .⁴¹

The men and women who settled at Plymouth were thus accustomed to supplying their own needs. Whatever their agricultural knowledge, it proved of little service to them when they reached America. They had been "delayed in their voyage and reached New England at the worst possible season of the year—the beginning of a bitter cold winter." During the first months they subsisted partly on corn and beans which had been stored in the ground by the Indians, and in 1621 they planted more Indian corn than European cereals. The European grains did not thrive and it was not until some years later that the Pilgrims succeeded in raising them.⁴² Maize, unknown to Europeans before the discovery of the New World, "had so many advantages as a pioneering crop that it took precedence immediately over the cereals with which they (the Pilgrims) were familiar and the seed of which they had brought with them."⁴³ After the coming

⁴¹ Prothero, 357-358.

⁴² Carrier, ch. 12.

⁴³ Bidwell and Falconer, 9.

of the better-equipped Massachusetts Bay Company European methods of culture were introduced. The social and agrarian background of its members was the same as that of the Pilgrim Fathers although its settlements probably included more men of substance than did the Plymouth colony.

EDMUND RUFFIN, SOUTHERNER

Professor Avery Craven's *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner* (New York and London, D. Appleton & Co., 1932. 283 p., illus.) is a brilliant historical study which combines a biography with a fresh and searching analysis of the forces that precipitated the calamitous War for Southern Independence. "The Old South that rose to completion in what are called ante-bellum days held no figure that better expressed her more pronounced temper and ways than did this Virginian. He was unique, of course, even among his own kind. All Southern gentlemen were. Yet as the greatest agriculturist in a rural civilization; one of the first and most intense Southern nationalists; and the man who fired the first gun at Sumter and ended his own life in grief when the civilization that had produced him perished on the field of battle, his story becomes to a striking degree that of the rise and fall of the Old South. It is from this viewpoint that this work has been undertaken."

The members of the Agricultural History Society who were fortunate enough to attend its annual meeting on the occasion of Professor Craven's presidency will not soon cease to recall his brilliant address on "Edmund Ruffin, Farmer," and they will rejoice to learn that *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner*, embodies not only the substance and much of the text of the presidential address but a great deal more on Ruffin the agriculturist. As extensive reviews of the study have already appeared elsewhere,¹

¹ Review by Henry Steele Commager in *New York Herald Tribune Books*, 8 (33):7 (Apr. 24, 1932); by C. McD. Puckette in *New York Times Book Rev.*, June 5, 1932, p. 10; by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton in *Va. Quart. Rev.*, 8:451-454 (July, 1932); by H. J. Eckenrode in *Va. Mag. Hist. and Biography*, 40:306 (July, 1932); by Wendell Holmes Stephenson in *Southwest. Social Sci. Quart.*, 13:296-297 (December, 1932); by J. L. Sellers in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 19:433-434 (December, 1932); by R. L. Biese in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:241-243 (January, 1933); by Rosser H. Taylor in *N. C. Hist. Rev.*, 10:142-144 (April, 1933); by W. K. Boyd in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:775-777 (July, 1933).

this notice may more properly be devoted to an indication of the volume's contents.

Chapter 1, A Gentleman of the Old South, is devoted to the personal aspects of "the man Edmund Ruffin who was to live the everyday life of a Southern gentleman in the trying period when the planters struggled against the ruin which an exploitative agricultural system had long wrought and which the very opportunities in cotton threatened to perpetuate; when a section was becoming conscious of its interests as in conflict with another 'civilization' rising to power in the North and West; when a 'peculiar order' based on negro slavery was beginning to wince under the moral attacks of its opponents and to meet open restraint in its passage into western territory." In this connection the salient facts concerning ancestry, education, personal characteristics, reading tastes, his plantation homes, and his family are given.

In the second chapter "A Gentleman's Religion and Politics" are analyzed. Ruffin's course in politics was that of "a gentleman planter—a process by which the Southern man would reach the conclusion that the gentleman's mind and ways were so exclusively sectional as to constitute a civilization there unique and worth dying to preserve; a development by which class rights were becoming sectional rights, by which personal attitudes were being transformed into social patterns and national purposes."

Ruffin's activities as a leading agriculturist of his period are considered in the next two chapters. His manifold experiments at Coggin's Point on the James are adequately summarized. His use of marl and writings on soil fertility assure a claim to his being designated the father of soil chemistry in America. The *Farmers' Register*, the agricultural survey of South Carolina, and the scientific efforts at "Marlbourne" on the Pamunkey are also discussed in detail.

In Chapter 5 the author reexamines some of the so-called Southern characteristics and makes "a much-needed distinction between the *Southerner*, and the *Southern Nationalist*." He minimizes the influence of climate in making the South a distinct community and asserts that "Only two factors seem to have con-

tributed to the making of anything distinctly Southern—an Old World country-gentleman ideal and the presence of negroes in large numbers.”

Of the remaining chapters, one is an excellent survey of the pro-slavery argument, another an orientation of the abolition movement, and the three concluding chapters are on the outbreak and culmination of the War Between the States together with Ruffin's part in it.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

DECEMBER MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

The Agricultural History Society will meet with the American Historical Association and other historical societies at Urbana, Illinois, on December 27-29, 1933. The session devoted to agricultural history will consist of a series of papers on the agricultural history of the Middle West. Dr. Charles T. Leavitt of Cedar Falls, Iowa, will speak on the influence of transportation changes on the development of the livestock industry of the Middle West to 1860; Professor William T. Hutchinson of the University of Chicago, on the reaper industry as related to the agricultural development of the Middle West from 1865 to 1875; Professor Harry J. Carman of Columbia University, on the reputation of Middle Western agriculture in England, 1850-1870; and Professor Louis Pelzer of the State University of Iowa, on pools and associations in the Western cattle ranges. Professor Herman Clarence Nixon of Tulane University will be the speaker at the Agricultural History Society's dinner, his subject being "The South in Our Times."

PERSONAL

Dr. Joseph Schafer, president of the Agricultural History Society during 1931-32, was honored with a doctor of laws degree on June 12, 1933, at the University of Oregon where he delivered the commencement address, his subject being "Social Prognosis." On July 21 he spoke at the unveiling of the Borglum statue of Harvey W. Scott, editor of the *Morning Oregonian* for forty-five years and one of the great pioneers in the Northwest.

Dr. Henry C. Taylor has been appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the recommendation of Secretary Henry A. Wallace as American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. A detailed statement concerning Dr. Taylor is given in the *B.A.E. News*, 29 (4):1-2 (Aug. 15, 1933).

A FUTURE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOURCE

The findings of the Land Utilisation Survey of Britain will be a valuable source for future historians of the agriculture of England, Scotland, and Wales. The immediate object of this survey is a cartographical record of the uses to which the surface of the country is being put at the present time. Dr. L. Dudley Stamp has explained the genesis of the undertaking, together with a detailed statement of its purposes, in papers before the Royal Geographical Society and the Royal Scottish Geographical Society. See *Geography*, 16:44-51 (March, 1931), the *Geographical Journal*, 78:40-53 (July, 1931), and the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 47:144-150 (May, 1931). The work on the project was begun in October, 1930, through the aid of an initial grant from the Rockefeller Research Foundation.

The record is being made on the six-inch Ordnance Survey maps as every individual field is already marked on them. A simple classification of land utilization has been adopted, and the actual survey has been carried out very largely by school children as an educational exercise.

When completed, the Land Utilisation Survey will be a valuable deposit of historical data on the status of British agriculture in 1931 and 1932. Changes in agricultural practice in Great Britain are taking place rapidly—for example, there is now less than half the area under the plough that there was fifty years ago—and yet there is no available record of the exact areas over which the shifts are being made. While statistics are available on a county basis and, in manuscript, on a parish basis, the lack of a cartographical record has made it impossible to evaluate the relative importance of the factors causing the shifts. For details on the progress of the project see the article by Dr. L. Dudley Stamp in *Nature* (London), 129:709-711 (May 14, 1932), the article by Clair Price entitled "A New Map of Great Britain Shown as a Living Portrait," in the *New York Times*, Apr. 23, 1933, the article by C. F. Close entitled "Land Utilization Maps of Great Britain," in the *Geographical Journal*, 81:541-543 (June, 1933), and the note in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 49:105-106 (March, 1933).—Everett E. Edwards.

NEW ENGLAND'S PROSPECT—1933

When William Wood published his *New England's Prospect* in 1634 he explained, "I undertooke this worke . . . because there hath some relations heretofore past the Presse, which have beene very imperfect; as also because there hath beene many scandalous and false reports past upon the Country, even from the sulphurous breath of every base ballad-monger: wherefore to perfect the one, and take off the other, I have laid down the nature of the Country, without any partiall respect unto it."

Similar motives prompted the collaboration of the twenty-seven specialists who have written *New England's Prospect—1933* (New York, 1933. 502 p., illus.), issued by the American Geographical Society as its *Special Publication 16*. Analyses of the various aspects of social, economic and governmental conditions and activities in contemporary New England are included. Each author has given particular attention to the progress of investigation in his subject, and has buttressed his paper with valuable bibliographical notes. The divergent interests of the several communities of New England as well as those common to the entire region are considered and also the conditions beyond its borders that affect its development.

The book opens with five introductory papers. James Truslow Adams presents "The Historical Background," in which he points out traits and developments in New England character and history that provide a background for the specialized discussions. An excellent description of the "Regions and Landscapes of New England" by John K. Wright follows. Papers on "Unemployment in New England: Some Fundamental Factors," "New England's Industrial Prospects," and "New England and the Northeast: A Statistical Comparison," complete the introductory section.

Students of agriculture will find much of interest and value in the twenty-five papers on specific problems which make up the main part of the study. In the final paper, "The Changing Geography of New England," John K. Wright, the editor, indicates changes that the forces of recent progress are bringing about in the geographical relationships of the people of New England. The volume is commended to all who would acquire a better

understanding of New England,—its place in American history, its present status, and its prospects.—*Everett E. Edwards.*

ARTICLES AND BOOKS OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Among the recent articles of interest to readers of *AGRICULTURAL HISTORY* are the following: (general or comprehensive): T. E. Steward, "How Man Found the Ten Principal Grains," *Northwest. Miller*, 178:692-693, 697 (Sept. 20, 1933); Samuel Rezneck, "The Depression of 1819-1822, a Social History," *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 39:28-47 (October, 1928); A. R. Eckler, "A Measure of the Severity of Depressions, 1873-1932," *Rev. Econ. Statis.*, 15:75-81 (May 15, 1933); W. H. Yarbrough, *Economic Aspects of Slavery in Relation to Southern and Southwestern Migration* (Nashville, Tenn., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1932. 112 p.); Earle D. Ross, "Horace Greeley and the West," *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:63-74 (June, 1933); Thomas Ewing, "Lincoln and the General Land Office, 1849," *Ill. State Hist. Soc. Jour.*, 25:139-153 (October, 1932); Asher Hobson, "An American Pioneer in International Agriculture [David Lubin]," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 14:574-585 (October, 1932); John D. Hicks, "The Third Party Tradition in American Politics," *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:3-28 (June, 1933); "Fiftieth Anniversary of the Alabama and Wisconsin Experiment Stations," editorial, *Expt. Sta. Rec.*, 69:161-164 (August, 1933); Neil F. Stevens, "The Dark Ages in Plant Pathology in America, 1830-1870," *Washington Acad. Sci. Jour.*, 23:435-446, maps (Sept. 15, 1933); Marion Beatrice McKay and Marjorie F. Warner, "Historical Sketch of Tulip Mosaic or Breaking; The Oldest Known Plant Virus Disease," *Natl. Hort. Mag.*, 12:179-216, illus. (July, 1933); T. Ralph Robinson, "Fruit-store Puzzles; Tropical Delicacies Finding New Friends," *Pan Amer. Union Bul.*, 67:101-108, illus. (February, 1933).

Arizona: Frank C. Lockwood, *Pioneer Days in Arizona: from the Spanish Occupation to Statehood* (New York, Macmillan Co., 1932. 387 p., illus.), especially ch. 10 on early agriculture. Reviewed by Clement Eaton in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:237-238 (January, 1933), by Samuel McKee, Jr., in *Hist. Outlook*, 24:110-111 (February, 1933).

Arkansas: W. A. Browne, "Grand Prairie [Arkansas]: A Progressive Rice Region," *Jour. Geogr.*, 31:147-148 (April, 1932).

Colorado: William Shelton, "The Threshing Machine for the Meeker Indian Agency, 1879," *Colo. Mag.*, 9:217-218 (November, 1932); Leon W. Fuller, "Governor Waite and His Silver Panacea," *ibid.*, 10:41-47 (March, 1933); Joseph O. Van Hook, "Development of Irrigation in the Arkansas Valley," *ibid.*, 10:3-11 (January, 1933); Le Roy R. Hafen, *Colorado: the Story of a Western Commonwealth* (Denver, Peerless Pub. Co., 1933. 328 p., illus.), reviewed by Colin B. Goodykoontz in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:288-289 (September, 1933).

Connecticut: Jarvis Means Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut's History, 1818-1850* (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1933. 359 p.), especially ch. 6, The Economic Basis of Society; Clarence Irving Hendrickson, "An Economic Study of the Agriculture of the Connecticut Valley; 4, A History of Tobacco Production in New England," *Conn. Agr. Expt. Sta., Storrs, Bul.* 174, 65 p. (October, 1931).

Delaware: R. O. Bausman, "The Economic and Historic Background of Farm

Tenancy in Delaware," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 15:164-167 (January, 1933); William Renwick Riddell, "Suggested Governmental Assistance to Farmers Two Centuries Ago," *Pa. Mag. Hist.*, 53:137-140 (April, 1929), based on a book, *Ways and Means for the Inhabitants of Delaware to Become Rich*, by Francis Rawle, published early in the 18th century.

Illinois: "An Illinois Farmer during the Civil War: Extracts from the Journal of John Edward Young, 1859-66," *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.*, 26:70-135 (April-July, 1933).

Iowa: Louis Bernard Schmidt, "Early Grain Farming in Iowa," *Midland Schools*, 47:157-159, illus. (February, 1933); Benjamin F. Shambaugh, editor, "Letters of J. W. Denison," connected with the Providence Western Land Company which invested in Iowa lands, *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Politics*, 31:87-126, 274-304 (January, April, 1933); William J. Peterson, "To the Land of Black Hawk," *Palimpsest*, 14:53-68 (February, 1933); Jacob A. Swisher, "The Half-breed Tract," *ibid.*, 69-76; Louis Pelzer, "Squatter Settlements," *ibid.*, 77-84; Mrs. Bertha M. H. Shambaugh, *Amana That Was and Amana That Is* (Iowa City, State Hist. Soc. Iowa, 1933. 502 p.), a reprint of the author's *Amana: The Community of True Inspiration* (1908), plus an interpretation of the changes wrought by the last two decades; *The Book of Iowa; from Iowa's Industrial Survey* ([Des Moines] The State, 1932. 268 p.), sec. 3, Agriculture, p. 80-148.

Kansas: Larry Freeman, "Kansas—the Nation's Bread Basket," *Highway Traveler* (Cleveland, Ohio), 4 (5):14-15, 39, illus. (October-November, 1932).

Kentucky: T. D. Clark, "The Ante-Bellum Hemp Trade of Kentucky with the Cotton Belt," *Ky. State Hist. Soc. Register*, 27:538-544 (May, 1929), and his "Live Stock Trade between Kentucky and the South, 1840-1860," *ibid.*, 569-581 (September, 1929); "Introduction of Imported Cattle in Kentucky; Diary of Charles T. Garrard," *ibid.*, 29:400-415, 30:37-60 (October, 1931, January, 1932).

Louisiana: Kathryn T. Abbey, "The Land Ventures of General Lafayette in the Territory of Orleans and State of Louisiana," *La. Hist. Quart.*, 16: 359-373 (July, 1933); Henry P. Dart, editor, "West Florida Documents Covering a Royal Land Grant on the Mississippi and Amite Rivers," *ibid.*, 12:630-644 (October, 1929); J. Hanno Deiler, "The System of Redemption in the State of Louisiana," a translation by Louis Voss of a book on the subject, *ibid.*, 12:426-440 (July, 1929); Amos W. Ford, "Two Years of Farm Relief in Louisiana," *Southwest. Social Sci. Quart.*, 13:234-249 (December, 1932); T. Lynn Smith, "Farm Trade Centers in Louisiana, 1901 to 1931," *La. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 234, 56 p. (January, 1933).

Maryland: Paul H. Giddens, "Land Policies and Administration in Colonial Maryland, 1753-1769," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, 28:142-171 (June, 1933).

Michigan: Vernon J. Brown, "Country Life in the Eighties," *Mich. Hist. Mag.*, 17:175-191 (Spring, 1933); Frank S. Kedzie, "Sugar Production in Michigan," *ibid.*, 16:296-303 (Summer, 1932); Bert Hudgins, "Bean Production in Michigan," *Econ. Geogr.*, 9:265-272 (July, 1933); J. F. Thaden, "Population Trends in Michigan," *Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta., East Lansing, Spec. Bul.* 236, 38 p. (June, 1933); J. O. Veatch, "Agricultural Land Classification and Land Types of Michigan," *ibid.*, 231, 51 p., illus. (April, 1933).

Minnesota: Everett E. Edwards, "Minnesota Agricultural Progress," *Minn. Alumni Weekly*, 32:525-526 (June 3, 1933); Theodore C. Blegen, "The Farmers' Crusade in Minnesota," *ibid.*, 32:511-512 (May 20, 1933); Franklin F. Holbrook

and Livia Appel, *Minnesota in the War with Germany* (St. Paul, Minn. Hist. Soc., 1928-32. 2 v.), noting v. 2, ch. 6, Food Production and Conservation, p. 144-166; Victor G. Pickett and Roland S. Vaile, *The Decline of Northwestern Flour Milling* (Minneapolis, Univ. Minn. Press, 1933. 83 p.), issued as Univ. Minn. Studies in Econ. and Business, no. 5, reviewed by C. B. Kuhlmann in *Minn. Hist.*, 14:206-207 (June, 1933).

Nebraska: Clarence Lorenzo Dow, "Precipitation Maps of Nebraska," *Geogr. Rev.*, 22:457-463 (July, 1932).

Nevada: E. O. Wooton, "The Public Domain of Nevada and Factors Affecting its Use," U. S. Dept. Agr. *Tech. Bul.* 301, 52 p., maps (April, 1932).

New Jersey: Carl R. Woodward, *New Jersey Agriculture, Past and Present* (New Brunswick, N. J. Agr. Expt. Sta., 1933. 31 p., illus.), a pictorial account with illustrations by George A. Bradshaw; E. John Long, "New Jersey Now!" *Natl. Geogr. Mag.*, 63:519-584, illus. (May, 1933).

New York: Jacqueline Overton, "Dutch and English Colonial Life on Long Island," *N. Y. Hist.*, 14:331-345 (October, 1933); Ruth L. Higgins, *Expansion in New York, with Especial Reference to the Eighteenth Century* (Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Press, 1931. 209 p., maps), reviewed by A. C. Flick in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 19:584-585 (March, 1933), by Robert G. Albion in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 39:135-138 (October, 1933); Thomas Childs Cochran, *New York in the Confederation: an Economic Study* (Philadelphia, Univ. Pa. Press, 1932. 220 p.), especially ch. 4-5, Land as a Factor in Economic Relations, reviewed by Robert G. Albion in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 39:135-138 (October, 1933); E. Wilder Spaulding, *New York in the Critical Period, 1783-1789* (New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1932. 334 p., maps), especially ch. 1, Business, Good and Bad, ch. 3, The Land, and ch. 4, The Politics of the Landlords, reviewed by Robert G. Albion in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 39:135-138 (October, 1933); Harry J. Carman, "Jesse Buel, Albany County Agriculturist," *N. Y. Hist.*, 14:241-249 (July, 1933); Maude Motley, "When Rochester was the 'Flour City,'" *Northwest. Miller*, 173:400-402, illus. (Feb. 15, 1933); Henry H. Wing, "The Cornell University Dairy Herd, 1889 to 1928," *N. Y. Agr. Expt. Sta.*, Ithaca, *Bul.* 576, 64 p., illus. (August, 1933).

Oklahoma: Joe B. Milam, "The Opening of the Cherokee Outlet," *Chron. Okla.*, 9:268-286, 454-475; 10:115-137 (September, 1931-March, 1932); A. Emma Estill, "The Great Lottery, August 6, 1901," opening the Kiowa-Comanche and Apache reservations, *ibid.*, 9:365-381 (December, 1931); Martha Buntin, "Beginning of the Leasing of the Surplus Grazing Lands on the Kiowa and Comanche Reservation," *ibid.*, 10:368-382 (September, 1932).

Pennsylvania: Julian E. Boyd, editor, *The Susquehanna Company Papers* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Wyoming Hist. and Geol. Soc., 1930-), reviewed by Lawrence H. Gipson in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:338-340 (January, 1933); and by Herman V. Ames in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:277-278 (September, 1933).

South Carolina: Francis Butler Simkins and Robert Hilliard Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill, Univ. N. C. Press, 1932. 610 p., illus.), reviewed by Benjamin B. Kendrick in the *Nation*, 135:61-62 (July 20, 1932), by Howard K. Beale in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:345-347 (January, 1933), by J. H. Easterby in *N. C. Hist. Rev.*, 10:85-87 (January, 1903), and by A. C. C. in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:129-130 (June, 1933); T. J. Woofter, Jr., *Black Yeomanry: Life on St. Helena Island* (New York, Henry Holt & Co. [1930]),

especially ch. 6, Breadwinning, and ch. 7, Agriculture, reviewed in *Ga. Hist. Quart.*, 16:159-160 (June, 1932); Guion Griffis Johnson, *A Social History of the Sea Islands, with Special Reference to St. Helena Island, South Carolina* (Chapel Hill, Univ. N. C. Press, 1930. 245 p.), reviewed by Ulrich B. Phillips in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 17:623-624 (March, 1931), and by Paul Lewinson in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:375-376 (January, 1933).

South Dakota: Paul H. Landis, "South Dakota Town-Country Trade Relations, 1901-1931," *S. Dak. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 274, 47 p. (Brookings, S. Dak., 1932).

Tennessee: James W. Patton, "The Progress of Emancipation in Tennessee, 1796-1860," *Jour. Negro Hist.* 17:67-102 (January, 1932); Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, Univ. N. C. Press, 1932. 392 p.), including a chapter on Andrew Jackson as a land speculator, reviewed by Ulrich B. Phillips in *Va. Quart. Rev.*, 8:607-609 (October, 1932), by Carl S. Driver in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 19:422-423 (December, 1932), and by Edmund C. Burnett in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:771-773 (April, 1933).

Texas: Lewis W. Newton and Herbert P. Gambrell, *A Social and Political History of Texas* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1932. 422 p.), reviewed by C. E. Castaneda in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:245-246 (January, 1933); Jules Verne Allen, *Cowboy Lore* (San Antonio, Naylor Print. Co., 1933); A. B. Bender, "Opening Routes Across West Texas, 1848-1850," *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 37: 116-135 (October, 1933); James K. Greer, editor, *A Texas Ranger and Frontiersman: the Days of Buck Barry in Texas, 1845-1906* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1932. 254 p.), especially the chapter on "The Daily Life of a Texas Settler in the Fifties," reviewed by W. P. Webb in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:230-233 (January, 1933), by E. Douglas Branch in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 20:286-287 (September, 1933); William Curry Holden, *Alkali Trails or Social and Economic Movements of the Texas Frontier, 1846-1900* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1930. 253 p.), containing chapters on the cattle kingdoms and droughts, reviewed by W. P. Webb in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 19:423-424 (December, 1932); and his *Rollie Burns: or an Account of the Ranching Industry of the South Plains* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1932. 243 p.), reviewed by Eugene C. Barker in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:239 (January, 1933); N. A. Jennings, *A Texas Ranger* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1930. 287 p.), a reprint of a Scribner book published in 1899, purporting to be the story of the author's experience in Texas for about three years following September, 1874; Roscoe C. Martin, *The People's Party in Texas; A Study in Third Party Politics* (Austin, Univ. Texas Press, 1933. 280 p.), reviewed by R. L. Biese in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 37:155-156 (October, 1933); Edwin J. Foscue, "Irrigation in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas," *Geogr. Rev.*, 23:457-463 (July, 1933); Edwin A. Elliott, "The Development of a Texas Cotton Plantation," *Southwest. Social Sci. Quart.*, 14:1-14 (June, 1933); T. C. Richardson, "Fifty Years of Farm and Ranch; A Half Century of Constructive Effort in Developing Agriculture in the Southwest," *Farm and Ranch*, 52 (7):1, 4, 12, 16, 24 (Apr. 1, 1933), also editorial, p. 8; Elmer H. Johnson, *The Basis of the Commercial and Industrial Development of Texas; A Study of the Regional Development of Texas Resources*, issued as Univ. Texas, Bur. Business Research, Research Monog. 9 (Mar. 1, 1933); W. T. Carter, "The Soils of Texas," *Texas Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 431, 192 p., illus. (College Station, July, 1931).

Virginia: Wesley F. Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment* (New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1932. 350 p.), reviewed by C. P. G. in *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, 19:578-579 (March, 1933); Thomas W. Claybrooke, "Diary of Travels from Virginia to Tennessee, 1832," including price data, *William and Mary Col. Quart. Hist. Mag.*, 13:163-169 (July, 1933); William Shepard, "Accounts of Buckingham Planters," *ibid.*, 180-181; Henry Harrison Simms, *Life of John Taylor: the Story of a Brilliant Leader in the Early Virginia State Rights School* (Richmond, Wm. Byrd Press, 1932. 234 p.), including a chapter on Taylor as a farmer and ante-bellum agricultural reformer, reviewed by William E. Dodd, Jr., in *William and Mary Col. Quart. Hist. Mag.*, 13:140-142 (April, 1933), by Philip Davidson in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:800 (July, 1933), by O. A. Dunlap in *So. Atlantic Quart.*, 32:312-313 (July, 1933), and by R. L. Biesele in *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 37:152-154 (October, 1933).

Washington: Oliver E. Baker, "Agricultural Regions of North America; Part 11, The Columbia Plateau Wheat Region," *Econ. Geogr.*, 9:165-197 (April, 1933); J. Wright Baylor, "Climate and Man in the Columbia Plateau Area," *Jour. Geogr.*, 30:265-279 (October, 1931); Wallace T. Buckley, "The Historical Geography of Spokane, an Inland Metropolis," *Bul. Geogr. Soc. Philadelphia*, 30:59-69 (January, 1932); Edward C. Johnson, "The Influence of Climate on Washington Agriculture," *Northwest. Sci.*, 7:17-24 (March, 1932); J. Orin Oliphant, "The Cattle Trade from the Far Northwest to Montana," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:69-83 (April, 1932), and his "The Cattle Trade of Puget Sound, 1858-1890," *ibid.*, 7:129-149 (July, 1933); Albert L. Seeman, "Economic Adjustments of the Olympic Peninsula," *Econ. Geogr.*, 8:299-310 (July, 1932); Leonard A. Wrinch, "The Formation of the Puget's Sound Agricultural Company," *Wash. Hist. Quart.*, 24:3-8 (January, 1933); Mrs. George Lotzgesell, "Pioneer Days at Old Dungeness," *ibid.*, 34:264-270 (October, 1933); Leo A. Borah, "Washington, the Evergreen State," *Natl. Geogr. Mag.*, 63:131-196 (February, 1933).

Wisconsin: Herman J. Deutsch, "Disintegrating Forces in Wisconsin Politics of the Early Seventies; The Ground Swell of 1873, and Railroad Politics," *Wis. Mag. Hist.*, 15:282-296, 391-411 (March, June, 1932); a second edition of Lawrence Martin's "The Physical Geography of Wisconsin," *Wis. Geol. and Nat. Hist. Survey Bul.* 36, *Educ. Ser.* 4 (Madison, 1932).

Wyoming: Dan W. Greenberg, *Sixty Years; A Brief Review of the Cattle Industry in Wyoming* (Cheyenne, Wyo. Stock Growers' Assoc., 1932. 73 p.).

ARTICLES AND BOOKS OF ENGLISH AGRICULTURE

W. Frank Perkins, compiler, *British and Irish Writers on Agriculture* (2d ed. Lymington, Chas. T. King, 1932. 193 p.), incorporating some 160 authors and two lists of anonyma not included in the first edition; Charles B. Fawcett, "The Anglo-Saxon Farmers," *Home Geogr. Mag.*, 2 (6):1-6 (December, 1932); R. A. Pelham, "Some Aspects of the East Kent Wool Trade in the Thirteenth Century," *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 44:218-228 (1932); R. A. Pelham, "The Distribution of Wool Merchants in Sussex," *Sussex Notes and Queries*, 4 (3); J. J. Simpson, "The Wool Trade and the Woolmen of Gloucestershire," *Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc., Trans.*, 52; Ernest L. Sabine, "Butchering in Mediaeval London," *Speculum*, 8:335-353 (July, 1933); James F. Willard, "The Use of Carts

in the Fourteenth Century," *History* (n.s.) 17:246-250 (October, 1932); Helen Elizabeth Muhlfeld, editor, *A Survey of the Manor of Wye* (New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, P. S. King & Son, 1933. 256 p.), a survey made about the middle of the fifteenth century of a manor belonging to Battle Abbey, with an introduction; Herbert W. Knocker, "The Evolution of the Holmesdale . . .; The Manor of Sundrish," *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 44:189-210 (1932); R. A. Brett James, "Some Extents and Surveys of Hendon," London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc., *Trans.*, 6 (4); A. K. Wickham, *The Villages of England* (London, B. T. Batsford, 1932. 64 p., illus.), a survey of types and characteristics from the Middle Ages to the 18th century; Basil Oliver, *The Cottages of England* (London, B. T. Batsford, 1932), a regional survey from the 16th to the 18th century; A. E. Levett, "Note on the Statutes of Labourers," *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 4:77-80 (October, 1932); H. Egerton Chesney, "The Transference of Lands in England, 1640-1660," *Roy. Hist. Soc. Trans.* (4th s.) 15:181-210 (1932); O. A. Marti, *The Economic Causes of the Reformation in England* (London, Macmillan & Co., 1929), reviewed by H. Sée in *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 4:248-249 (April, 1933); C. H. Firth, "Macaulay's Third Chapter," *History* (n.s.) 17:201-219 (October, 1932); G. E. Fussell, "The Breast Plough," *Man*, 33:109-114, illus. (July, 1933), his "Farmers' Calendars from Tusser to Arthur Young," *Econ. Hist.*, 2:521-535 (January, 1933), and his "The First English Book on Sheep," *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 40:436-440 (August, 1933), concerning William Ellis's *A Compleat System of Experienced Improvements Made on Sheep* (London, 1749); G. H. Fowler, "The Strip Map of Aspley Guise, c. 1745; with an Analysis of the Inclosure Award, 1761," *Bedfordshire Hist. Rec. Soc. Quarto Memoirs* (1932) 2 (3); E. W. Dormer, "A Berkshire Enclosure by Mutual Consent, 1794," *Berks. Arch. Jour.*, 36 (1); V. M. Lavrovsky [Enclosures in Suffolk, 1797-1803; concerning nine parishes; in part based on MSS. in British Museum], *Akademiia Nauk* (S.S.S.R.), Leningrad, *Izvestiia, Otdelenie Obshchestvennykh Nauk*, 1932; Arthur Young, *Tours in England and Wales* (Selected from the *Annals of Agriculture*), issued by the London School of Economics and Political Science as No. 14 in its Series of Reprints of Scarce Tracts in Econ. and Polit. Sci., reviewed by T. S. Ashton in *Economica*, (39): 99-101 (February, 1933); *A Frenchman in England, 1784; Being the Melanges sur l'Angleterre of Francois de la Rochefoucauld* (Cambridge, Univ. Press; New York, Macmillan Co., 1933. 256 p.), edited from the MS. with an introduction by Jean Marchand, and translated with notes by S. C. Roberts; C. R. Fay, *The Corn Laws and Social England* (New York, Macmillan Co., 1932. 223 p.), reviewed by Arthur L. Dunham in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, 38:794 (April, 1933); Chester Kirby, "The Attack on the English Game Laws in the Forties," *Jour. Modern Hist.*, 4:18-37 (March, 1932); A. G. Bradley, "Decline of British Agriculture," *Fortnightly Rev.*, 138:92-102 (July, 1932); J. Fairfax-Blakeborough, "Yorkshire's Language of the Land," *Yorkshire Agr. Soc. Trans.* (1932) 90:77-90; J. R. Bond, "Derbyshire Farming, Past and Present," *Roy. Soc. England Jour.*, 93:165-189 (1932); J. A. Scott Watson, "Glimpses of Old-Time Scottish Farming," *Scot. Jour. Agr.*, 11:131-136 (April, 1928); James Ritchie, "Whin-bruisers and Whin-mills; Relics of Scottish Farming in the Past," *ibid.*, 13:390-398 (October, 1930); Andrew O'Dell, "The Population of Scotland, 1755-1931: A General Survey," *Scot. Geogr. Mag.*, 48:282-290 (Sept. 15, 1932).

